


SEP 26 1983

82 6741



IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OCTOBER TERM, 1982

T. J. HAYES

PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF ARKANSAS

RESPONDENT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE SUPREME COURT OF ARKANSAS

JEFFREY M. ROSENZWEIG
310 Three Hundred Spring
Bldg.
Little Rock, Ark. 72201
(501) 372-5247
Attorney for Petitioner
pro hac vice

NO. 82 6741

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OCTOBER TERM, 1982

T. J. HAYES

PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF ARKANSAS

RESPONDENT

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE SUPREME COURT OF ARKANSAS

Petitioner, T. J. Hayes, a prisoner under sentence of death, petitions for a writ of certiorari to review the affirmance of his conviction of capital murder and sentence of death.

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether a capital defendant's rights under the Fifth, Sixth, Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments are violated by the absence, in the Arkansas death penalty statutes and case law developed by the Arkansas Supreme Court, of standards for comparative review of sentences. and to inquire as to an erroneous jury finding.

OPINION BELOW

The opinion of the Supreme Court of Arkansas, reproduced in the appendix hereto, is reported as Hayes v. State, 278 Ark. 211, 645 S.W. 2d 662 (1983). This appeal was from Petitioner's second conviction. His first conviction was reversed and remanded for failure by the State to comply with discovery orders for his psychiatric records. Hayes v. State, 274 Ark. 440, 625 S.W. 2d 498 (1981).

JURISDICTION

The decision of the Arkansas Supreme Court denying a timely petition for rehearing and issuing the mandate was handed down February 28, 1983. Mr. Justice Blackmun extended the time for filing a petition for writ of certiorari to May 16, 1983. This Court's jurisdiction is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1257(3) with Petitioner asserting deprivation of rights secured by the U.S. Constitution

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On or about July 16, 1979 two persons were killed in Jefferson County, Arkansas. Shortly thereafter, Petitioner T. J. Hayes was charged with capital murder by a felony information filed in the Circuit Court of Jefferson County. Petitioner, who is black, was declared indigent, and counsel was appointed to represent him. Petitioner was tried in October, 1980 and was convicted and sentenced to death by electrocution. This conviction and sentence was reversed by the Supreme Court of Arkansas for failure by the State to comply with court orders regarding release of Petitioner's psychiatric records. Hayes v. State, 274 Ark. 440, 625 S.W. 2d 498 (1981).

Petitioner was again tried in May, 1982, and again convicted and sentenced to death. This conviction and sentence was affirmed by the Supreme Court of Arkansas. Hayes v. State, 278 Ark. 211, 645 S.W. 2d 662 (1983). A timely petition for rehearing was denied, and the mandate issued on February 28, 1983. The Court subsequently granted his appointed counsel's motion to be relieved, and stayed the execution date (which had been scheduled for April 1) to permit him to petition the United States Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari.

From the affirmance of his conviction by the Supreme Court of Arkansas, Petitioner brings this

petition for writ of certiorari. The time for
filing a petition for writ of certiorari was ex-
tended by Mr. Justice Blackmun to May 16, 1983

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND STATUTES INVOLVED

Fifth Amendment, United States Constitution:

No person shall be...deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law;...

Sixth Amendment, United States Constitution

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the state and district wherein the crime shall have been committed...and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

Eighth Amendment, United States Constitution:

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

Fourteenth Amendment, United States Constitution:

...(N)or shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Ark. Stat. Ann. 41-1501(1)

A person commits capital murder if:

- (a)....
- (b)....
- (c)....with the premeditated and deliberated purpose of causing the death of any person, he causes the death of two (2) or more persons in the course of the same criminal episode.

Ark. Stat. Ann. 41-1301:

The following procedures shall govern trials of persons charged with capital murder:

- (1) The jury shall first hear all evidence relevant to the charge or charges and shall then retire to reach a verdict of guilt or innocence.
- (2) If the defendant is found not guilty of the capital offense charged, but guilty of a lesser included offense, sentence shall be determined and imposed as pro-

vided by law.

(3). If the defendant is found guilty of capital murder, the same jury shall sit again in order to hear additional evidence as provided by subsection (4) hereof, and to determine sentence in the manner provided by section 1302 (41-1302); except that, if the state waives the death penalty, stipulates that no aggravating circumstance exists, or stipulates that mitigating circumstances outweigh aggravating circumstances, no such hearing shall be required, and the trial court shall sentence the defendant to life imprisonment without parole.

(4). In determining sentence, evidence may be presented to the jury as to any matters relating to aggravating circumstances enumerated in section 1303 (41-1303), or any mitigating circumstances. Evidence as to any mitigating circumstances may be presented by either the state or the defendant regardless of its admissibility under the rules governing admission of evidence in trials of criminal matters; but the admissibility of evidence relevant to aggravating circumstances set forth in section 1303(41-1303) shall be governed by the rules governing the admission of evidence in such trials. The state and the defendant or his counsel shall be permitted to present argument respecting sentencing.

Ark. Stat. Ann. 41-1302:

(1) The jury shall impose a sentence of death if it unanimously returns written findings that:

- (a) aggravating circumstances exist beyond a reasonable doubt; and
- (b) aggravating circumstances outweigh beyond a reasonable doubt all mitigating circumstances found to exist; and
- (c) aggravating circumstances justify a sentence of death beyond a reasonable doubt

(2) The jury shall impose a sentence of life imprisonment without parole if it finds that:

- (a) aggravating circumstances do not exist beyond a reasonable doubt; or
- (b) aggravating circumstances do not outweigh beyond a reasonable doubt all mitigating circumstances found to exist; or
- (c) aggravating circumstances do not justify a sentence of death beyond a reasonable doubt

(3) If the jury does not make all findings required by subsection (1), the court shall impose a sentence of life imprisonment without parole.

Ark. Stat. Ann. 41-1303:

Aggravating circumstances shall be limited to the following:

(1) the capital murder was committed by a person imprisoned as a result of a felony conviction;

(2) the capital murder was committed by a person unlawfully at liberty after being sentenced to imprisonment as a result of a felony conviction;

(3) the person previously committed another felony an element of which was the use or threat of violence to another person or creating a substantial risk of death or serious physical injury to another person;

(4) the person in the commission of the capital murder knowingly created a great risk of death to a person other than the victim;

(5) the capital murder was committed for the purpose of avoiding or preventing an arrest or effecting an escape from custody;

(6) the capital murder was committed for pecuniary gain; or

(7) the capital murder was committed for the purpose of disrupting or hindering the lawful exercise of any government or political function.

Ark. Stat. Ann. 41-1304

Mitigating circumstances shall include, but are not limited to the following:

(1) the capital murder was committed while the defendant was under extreme mental or emotional disturbance;

(2) the capital murder was committed while the defendant was acting under unusual pressures or influences or under the domination of another person;

(3) the capital murder was committed while the capacity of the defendant to appreciate the wrongfulness of his conduct or to conform his conduct to the requirements of law was impaired as the result of mental disease or defect, intoxication, or drug abuse;

(4) the youth of the defendant at the time of the commission of the capital murder;

(5) the capital murder was committed by another person and the defendant was an accomplice and his participation relatively minor.

(6) the defendant has no significant history of prior criminal activity

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

THE ABSENCE OF STANDARDS FOR COMPARATIVE REVIEW OF DEATH SENTENCES IN ARKANSAS, AND THE REFUSAL OF THE ARKANSAS COURTS TO VACATE IN THE LIGHT OF AN ERRONEOUS JURY FINDING VIOLATES PETITIONER'S RIGHTS UNDER THE FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS.

This case affords the Court an opportunity to delineate standards for comparative review in capital cases, and to outline the obligations of lower courts where there is an erroneous jury finding.

There are seven formulations of capital murder in Arkansas. Ark. Stat. Ann. 41-1501. Petitioner was charged and convicted under Ark. Stat. Ann. 41-1501(1)(c), the premeditated and deliberated killing of two persons in the same criminal episode. Petitioner presented a defense of diminished capacity due to alcoholism and various psychiatric problems.

Arkansas provides seven possible aggravating circumstances; six mitigating circumstances are listed, but the jury is not thereby limited. The jury determines the existence or non-existence of the circumstances, then performs a weighing test to determine whether to impose a sentence of death or of life imprisonment without parole.

Pursuant to instructions promulgated by the Supreme Court, interrogatories are submitted to the jury, as was done in Petitioner's trial. The section on mitigating circumstances has four parts: unanimous

findings of existence, non-unanimous findings of existence, findings that evidence was presented but that the evidence did not support a finding of existence, this being a unanimous verdict, and, finally, a finding that there was no evidence.

In Petitioner's case, the jury found one aggravating circumstance: that he had previously committed a felony an element of which was the use or threat of violence to another person or creating a substantial risk of death or serious physical injury to another person. The jury found no evidence of any mitigating circumstance, this despite the fact that among the mitigating circumstances available was that "the capacity...to appreciate the wrongfulness of his conduct or to conform his conduct to the requirements of law was impaired as a result of mental disease or defect, intoxication, or drug abuse," and that evidence was presented as to his alcohol and psychiatric problems. The jury finding that no evidence was presented was thus clearly erroneous. If evidence was presented and the jury was not convinced or swayed by it, the proper answer would have been that the evidence was presented but that the jury unanimously found that it did not exist at the time.

The Arkansas Supreme Court stated merely that in its comparative review of sentences, it found the sentence not excessive. The Court did not address the issue of an erroneous finding on the penalty phase interrogatory.

The United States Supreme Court has noted for some time the requirement of detailed appellate review of capital cases, and has looked with approval upon those states that present standards for review for integrity and consistency of verdicts and to guard against those arbitrarily, capriciously or freakishly applied. Gregg v. Georgia, 428 U.S. 153, 96 S.Ct. 2909, 49 L.Ed. 2d 859 (1976). Proffitt v. Florida, 428 U.S. 242, 96 S.Ct. 2960, 49 L.Ed. 2d 913 (1976).

The Arkansas Supreme Court has stated in several opinions that it exercises comparative review. Sumlin v. State, 273 Ark. 185, 617 S.W. 2d 372 (1981). Sumlin's sentence was reduced to conform to that assessed against Mrs. Sumlin in the same incident. Subsequent to the rendering of the opinion in Peterson's case, the Arkansas court reduced a death sentence to life without parole because the defendant was only an accomplice and the jury may have sentenced him out of passion and prejudice. Henry v. State, 278 Ark. 478 (Feb. 28, 1983). A concurring opinion by Justice Hickman noted that Henry was the "first capital case in which we have actually had to compare the propriety of the death sentence with the sentence

in other cases." Justice Hickman referred to the court having "made a pact, so to speak, that we would, on our own, make certain that the death penalty was not the result of passion, prejudice or excessive under the circumstances." 278 Ark. at 496.

The Arkansas court thus indicated that it employs comparative review. However, except for saying why Sumlin's and Henry's sentences were reduced, enunciated standards to govern the process of review. The Ninth Circuit has noted that for comparative review to be meaningful, there must be ascertainable and reviewable standards. Harris v. Pulley, 692 F.2d 1189 (1982).


In reading Petitioner's case in the light of Arkansas' decision in Henry, it is clear that no standards were used in comparing Hayes' sentence with others. For instance, no mention was made of any reasoning process behind the review, but rather merely a conclusion. Particularly, in the light of the fact that the absolute minimum number of aggravating circumstances were found (one) under which the death penalty could be assessed and that the jury found that no evidence was presented for a certain proposition (in contradiction with the facts of the testimony, the weight of it being another matter), the review done by the Arkansas court is meaningless. Moreover, the failure of the Arkansas Supreme Court to vacate the sentence in light of this incorrect finding with regard to lack of miti-

gation is in itself violative of Petitioner's rights of due process, fair trial, and guarantee against cruel and unusual punishment.

CONCLUSION


The petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Arkansas should be granted and the holding of that court reversed. This Court should set this matter for oral argument on the issues outlined above.

Respectfully submitted,


JEFFREY M. ROSENZWEIG
310 Three Hundred Spring Bldg.
Little Rock, Ark. 72201
(501) 372-5247
Attorney for Petitioner pro
hac vice and pro bono pub-
lico

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE


I, Jeffrey M. Rosenzweig, attorney for Petitioner, do hereby certify that I have mailed a copy of the foregoing Petition for Writ of Certiorari to Hon. Matthew Fleming, Assistant Attorney General, Justice Building, Little Rock, Ark. 72201 by depositing the same in the U.S. mail, first class postage prepaid this 13 day of May, 1983.



JEFF ROSENZWEIG
ATTORNEY AT LAW
310
THREE HUNDRED SPRING BUILDING
LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS 72201

PHONE 372-5247

May 13, 1983



Hon. Alexander Stevas
Clerk
Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D.C.

82 6741

RE: T.J. HAYES VS. ARKANSAS


Dear Sir:

Enclosed with this letter is a Petition for Writ of Certiorari, the time for filing of which was extended by Mr. Justice Blackmun to May 16. This letter and petition is sent via Express Mail.

Mr. Hayes has been declared indigent by the Circuit Court of Jefferson County Arkansas and the Supreme Court of Arkansas, and I am handling this matter on a pro bono publico basis. Due to the vagaries of getting mail from Mr. Hayes place of incarceration, the Death Row section of the Cummins Unit of the Arkansas Department of Correction, and, I suspect, Mr. Hayes' mental condition, I do not have a current signed affidavit from Mr. Hayes. However, I will be seeing him in person in the near future and will be able to get his signature on an affidavit to proceed in forma pauperis.

Thank you very much for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely yours,


Jeff Rosenzweig

JR:jm
Encl.
cc: Matthew Fleming

T. J. HAYES v. STATE of Arkansas

CR 82-113

Supreme Court of Arkansas

Opinion delivered January 24, 1985

1. **CRIMINAL LAW — DEATH QUALIFIED JURY NOT BIASED IN FAVOR OF PROSECUTION.** — The Supreme Court has consistently rejected the argument that the defendant was denied an impartial jury because the jury was "death qualified" and therefore was biased in favor of the prosecution.
2. **CRIMINAL LAW — DEATH PENALTY NOT UNCONSTITUTIONAL.** — The Supreme Court has consistently rejected the argument that the Arkansas death penalty is unconstitutional.
3. **CRIMINAL PROCEDURE — NO VIOLATION OF EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSE TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN PERSONS SERVING PRISON TERM WHILE AWAITING TRIAL AND THOSE INCARCERATED ONLY ON PRINCIPAL CHARGE.** — A.R. Cr. P. Rules 28.1 — 30.2 make a valid distinction for purpose of the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment between persons serving a term of imprisonment on another conviction while awaiting trial on the principal charge and persons incarcerated solely as a result of the principal charge.
4. **APPEAL & ERROR — SAME ARGUMENT WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED AGAIN ON SECOND APPEAL.** — Where appellant's other arguments regarding his right to a speedy trial were resolved on his first appeal, they will not be considered again.
5. **EVIDENCE — INFLAMMATORY PHOTOGRAPHS ADMISSIBLE IF SHED LIGHT ON ANY ISSUE.** — Even inflammatory photographs are admissible in the sound discretion of the trial court if they tend to shed light on any issue or are useful to enable a witness to better describe the objects portrayed or the jury to better understand the testimony.
6. **EVIDENCE — PHOTOGRAPHS NOT INADMISSIBLE MERELY BECAUSE THEY ARE CUMULATIVE.** — A photograph is not rendered inadmissible merely because it is cumulative.
7. **EVIDENCE — DECISION ON ADMISSIBILITY OF PHOTOGRAPHS NOT REVERSED UNLESS CLEAR ABUSE OF DISCRETION.** — The Supreme Court will not reverse the decision of the trial court to admit photographic evidence unless there is a clear abuse of discretion.
8. **TRIAL — WIDE DISCRETION IN GRANTING OR DENYING OF MISTRIAL — NOT REVERSED ABSENT ABUSE OF DISCRETION OR MANIFEST PREJUDICE.** — The trial court is granted a wide discretion in

- granting or denying a mistrial, and its decision will not be reversed except for abuse of discretion or manifest prejudice.
9. TRIAL — DISCRETION NOT ABUSED IN DENIAL OF MISTRIAL. — It cannot be said that the trial court abused its discretion in denying the motion for mistrial where the undesired response was elicited by appellant's attorney.

Appeal from Jefferson Circuit Court, First Division;
Randall L. Williams, Judge; affirmed.

Leon N. Jamison of Jamison & Glover, for appellant.

Steve Clark, Atty. Gen., by: Matthew Wood Fleming, Asst. Atty. Gen., for appellee.

RICHARD B. ADKISSON, Justice. This is the second time that appellant, T. J. Hayes, has been convicted by a jury of the capital felony murder of his girlfriend, Catherine Carter, and a cab driver, J. W. Lunsford, and sentenced to death. On the first appeal we reversed and remanded, *Hayes v. State*, 274 Ark. 440, 625 S.W.2d 498 (1981). We now affirm.

At trial, the girlfriend's parents testified that on the afternoon of July 16, 1979, appellant and their daughter, who were both black, were at their home in Pine Bluff. By previous agreement with the Yellow Cab Company, a cab was to pick the daughter up for work at about 2:30 p.m. each afternoon. On that particular day when the cab with a white male driver arrived, their daughter and appellant got into the cab. At approximately 2:30 p.m. that same afternoon a security officer on duty in front of the Arkansas Department of Correction Administration Building saw appellant and a black female in Yellow Cab No. 11, driven by a white male, pass by going about 20 miles per hour on Princeton Pike.

According to a statement appellant gave to the police, he told the cab driver to drive out on Princeton Pike where they stopped at an unoccupied house. All three got out, and appellant, who was armed with a .38 caliber pistol, told the cab driver to go back to town. The cab driver made a move as though he was attempting to disarm appellant, and appellant shot him twice. Appellant and the girlfriend then

entered the house, where the girlfriend told him to forget her, that she did not want to see him anymore because she was interested in someone else. Appellant shot her twice. Appellant then drove the cab to Townsend Park and hid it in a wooded area.

At about 3:30 p.m. the security officer saw appellant driving the cab in which he had seen the three of them earlier. Later that day between 4:15 p.m. and 4:30 p.m. appellant walked into the Jefferson County Sheriff's Office and announced that he wanted to turn himself in saying, "I think I just killed my girlfriend." He then led officers of the Pine Bluff Police Department to the scene of the crime and to the place where he had hidden the cab. About 7:30 p.m. that evening, after being fully advised of his rights, he gave a statement to officers from the sheriff's office and signed a waiver form. We find sufficient evidence to support the jury's finding that appellant was guilty as charged.

Appellant argues: that he was denied an impartial jury because the jury selected was "death qualified" and therefore was biased in favor of the prosecution; and that the Arkansas death penalty is unconstitutional. This court has consistently rejected each of these arguments. *Coble v. State*, 274 Ark. 134, 624 S.W.2d 421 (1981); *Simpson v. State*, 274 Ark. 188, 623 S.W.2d 200 (1981); *Miller v. State*, 269 Ark. 341, 605 S.W.2d 430 (1980), cert. denied, ___ U.S. ___, 101 S.Ct. 1750 (1981); *Williams v. State*, 276 Ark. 399, 635 S.W.2d 265 (1982). *Collins v. State*, 261 Ark. 195, 548 S.W.2d 106 (1977); *Swindler v. State*, 267 Ark. 418, 592 S.W.2d 91 (1979).

Appellant argues that he has not been accorded equal protection of the law in violation of the United States Constitution Amendment 14 because the speedy trial provisions of A.R.Cr.P. Rules 28.1—30.2, Ark. Stat. Ann., Vol. 4A (Repl. 1977) distinguish between persons serving a term of imprisonment on another conviction while awaiting trial on the principal charge (must be brought to trial within eighteen months), and persons incarcerated as a result of the principal charge to be tried (must be brought to trial within eighteen months, but entitled to release from incarceration after nine months). We reject this argument because neither

is entitled to absolute discharge until eighteen months under Rule 30. Furthermore, appellant has failed to show any prejudice resulting from his incarceration prior to trial.

Appellant's other arguments regarding his right to a speedy trial were resolved on his first appeal, *Hayes v. State* *supra* and will not be considered again.

Appellant argues that the trial court erred in admitting certain photographs and slides which were alleged to be redundant and introduced solely to inflame the jury. Even inflammatory photographs are admissible in the sound discretion of the trial court if they tend to shed light on an issue or are useful to enable a witness to better describe the objects portrayed or the jury to better understand the testimony. *Sumlin v. State*, 266 Ark. 709, 587 S.W.2d 511 (1979). Here, the trial court could have concluded that the photographs and slides would help the jury to understand the crime scene, the sequence of events, and the nature of the wounds inflicted. Also, a photograph is not rendered inadmissible merely because it is cumulative. *Prunty v. State*, 271 Ark. 77, 607 S.W.2d 374 (1980). We will not reverse the decision of the trial court unless there is a clear abuse of discretion; no such abuse has been shown here.

Appellant argues that the trial court erred in granting a mistrial when, during direct examination, a defense witness referred to the fact that appellant had been paroled.

[Mr. Jamison, Attorney for Appellant]

Q You did counsel Mr. Hayes personally on a few occasions.

[Witness Bessie Lancelin]

A Yes.

Q Just what does that entail — the counseling sessions?

A Well, it would depend. In his particular situation, he had been referred to us by his probation officer at the

time because he had been recently paroled. So it would vary with different people. And we had to set up a plan that was individualized that would meet his particular needs. You want to know what I said to him at the time that he came in?

After the witness had been cross-examined, the following exchange took place in chambers:

Mr. Jamison: Your Honor, I do have one more motion to make. During the testimony of Bessie Lancelin, and without my — I guess I did solicit the answer. Ms. Lancelin did refer to the fact that Mr. Hayes was on parole, and I did not do this in order to try to create some technicality for a new trial, but I do feel that that answer was — or the referral to Mr. Hayes' being on parole was prejudicial, and for that reason I would move for a mistrial.

The Court: Of course, the Court heard the testimony and I'm willing to instruct the jury to totally disregard it and not consider it for any purpose whatsoever or any other reasonable request that you could make. Since the answer was elicited — Not directly, but it was a result of direct examination by a defense witness, to some extent, at least, it was invited. The witness probably should have been cautioned by counsel before testifying not to mention that fact. It of course came as a surprise to me. But at this time I'd be glad to instruct the jury or take whatever action necessary short of a mistrial. I would deny the motion for a mistrial.

Mr. Jamison: Your Honor, I do feel that regarding any more reference to that statement by her, I don't think it should be brought to the jury's attention. I do think that it would just invite more attention to that particular statement.

The Court: Okay.

The trial court also instructed the prosecutor to refrain from making any references to the fact that appellant was on parole.

The trial court is granted a wide latitude of discretion in granting or denying a mistrial, and its decision will not be reversed except for abuse of discretion or manifest prejudice. *Cobb v. State*, 265 Ark. 527, 579 S.W.2d 612 (1979). Here, we cannot say the trial court abused its discretion in denying the motion for mistrial where the undesired response was elicited by appellant's attorney.


We find no evidence that the jury's verdict was based on either passion or prejudice, nor do we find the imposition of the death penalty in this case to be arbitrary, capricious, or wanton. In our comparative review of death sentences, we find the sentence not excessive.

In the sentencing phase of the trial the jury received as evidence of aggravating circumstances three prior felony convictions, one for second degree murder and two for shooting with intent to kill or wound. This evidence supported the jury's finding that appellant had previously committed another felony, an element of which was the use or threat of violence to another person. At appellant's insistence his sister was not allowed to testify regarding mitigating circumstances; the jury found none existed. The jury's finding that the aggravating circumstances outweigh beyond a reasonable doubt any mitigating circumstances is supported by the evidence.

We have examined all objections pursuant to Rule 11 (f), Rules of the Supreme Court, Ark. Stat. Ann., Vol. 3A (Repl. 1977) and find no error. See *Earl v. State*, 272 Ark. 5, 611 S.W. 2d 98 (1981).

Affirmed.

NO. 82-6741



IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1982

T. J. HAYES

PETITIONER

VS

STATE OF ARKANSAS

RESPONDENT

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE SUPREME COURT OF ARKANSAS

BRIEF FOR RESPONDENT IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION

STEVE CLARK
Attorney General

BY: MATTHEW WOOD FLEMING
Assistant Attorney General
Justice Building
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201
(501) 371-2007

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1982

T. J. HAYES

PETITIONER

VS

STATE OF ARKANSAS

RESPONDENT

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE SUPREME COURT OF ARKANSAS

BRIEF FOR RESPONDENT IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION

Respondent, State of Arkansas, responds to petitioner's petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Arkansas.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Whether petitioner was denied his Fifth, Sixth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Admendment rights by the absence of statutory standards for comparative review of death sentences in Arkansas.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE NO.
QUESTIONS PRESENTED.....	i.
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iii. & iv.
OPINIONS BELOW.....	v.
JURISDICTION.....	v.
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS.....	v.
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	v.
REASONS FOR DENYING THE WRIT.....	1-8
I. ARKANSAS CASE LAW AND THE RULES OF THE ARKANSAS SUPREME COURT PROVIDE FOR A MEANINGFUL STANDARD OF COM- PARATIVE REVIEW OF DEATH CASES.....	1-8
CONCLUSION.....	8-9
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....	10
APPENDIX A-1.....	11
APPENDIX A-2.....	12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>CASES</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
<u>Baldwin v. Balkcom</u> , 524 F.Supp. 332, (W.D.La. 1981).....	5
<u>Baldwin v. Blackburn</u> , 653 F.2d 942 (5th Cir. 1983).....	4
<u>Barfield v. Harris</u> , 540 F.Supp. 451 (E.D.N.C. 1982).	6
<u>Collins v. State</u> , 261 Ark. 195, 548 S.W.2d 106 (1977), <u>cert. denied</u> , 434 U.S. 878 (1977).....	1,3,4,5
<u>Douglas v. California</u> , 372 U.S. 353 (1963).....	2
<u>Enmond v. Florida</u> , July 2, 1981, 50 U.S.L.W. 5087 ____ U.S. ____ (1982).....	7
<u>Estelle v. Dorrough</u> , 420 U.S. 523 (1975).....	1
<u>Gilmore v. Utah</u> , 429 U.S. 1012 (1976).....	4
<u>Gray v. Lucas</u> , 677 F.2d 1086 (5th Cir. 1982).....	5
<u>Gregg v. Georgia</u> , 428 U.S. 153 (1976).....	2,3,4,7,8
<u>Hayes v. State</u> , 274 Ark. 440, 625 S.W.2d 498 (1981).....	iv.
<u>Hayes v. State</u> , 278 Ark. 211, 645 S.W.2d 662 (1983).....	iv.
<u>Henry v. State</u> , 278 Ark. 478, ____ S.W.2d ____ (1983).....	7
<u>Proffitt v. Florida</u> , 428 U.S. 242 (1976).....	2,3,4,6,8
<u>Roberts v. Louisiana</u> , 431 U.S. 133 (1977).....	8
<u>Ross v. Moffitt</u> , 417 U.S. 600 (1974).....	1
<u>State v. Dixon</u> , 283 So.2d 1 (1973).....	2,3
<u>Sumlin v. State</u> , 273 Ark. 185, 617 S.W.2d 372 (1981).....	6,7

STATUTES

PAGE NO.

Ark. Stat. Ann. § 41-1501 (Repl. 1977).....	1
Ark. Stat. Ann. § 41-1301 (Repl. 1977).....	1

MISCELLANEOUS

Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States: Rule 17.1(c).....	8,9
---	-----

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the Supreme Court of Arkansas affirming petitioner's conviction for capital murder is reported as Hayes v. State, 278 Ark. 211, 645 S.W.2d 662 (1983). That opinion is filed as part of petitioner's appendix. That appeal was petitioner's second for conviction of the same offense. Petitioner's first conviction was reversed and remanded. That opinion is reported as Hayes v. State, 274 Ark. 440, 625 S.W.2d 498 (1981) and is attached hereto in the appendix to this response at A-1.

JURISDICTION

The respondent concurs that this court has jurisdiction to review this case.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS

The petitioner has adequately set forth the constitutional and statutory provisions involved in this proceeding.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner's statement of the case is sufficient to advise this court of the proceedings below leading to this petition.

REASONS FOR DENYING THE WRIT

I. ARKANSAS CASE LAW AND THE RULES OF THE ARKANSAS SUPREME COURT PROVIDE FOR A MEANINGFUL STANDARD OF COMPARATIVE REVIEW OF DEATH CASES.

Petitioner alleges that the laws of the State of Arkansas administering the procedures for the trial of one charged with the crime of capital murder. (Ark. Stat. Ann. §41-1501 (Repl. 1977)) are violative of the Fifth, Sixth, Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America in that they fail to provide for a statutorily mandated comparative review of sentences with other persons convicted of capital murder and sentenced to death. Petitioner also argues a failure of the state appellate court to inquire into what he refers to as "an erroneous jury finding" also taints the Arkansas statutes (Ark. Stat. Ann. §41-1301, et. seq. (Repl. 1977)).

The issue of the scope and adequacy of the review undertaken by the Arkansas Supreme Court in death cases is detailed at length in the opinion of Collins v. State, 261 Ark. 195, 211-24, 548 S.W.2d 106 (1977), cert. denied, 434 U.S. 878 (1977). (Attached at Appendix A-2).

In reviewing this issue, it should not be overlooked that there is no federal constitutional right to state appellate review of state criminal convictions. Estelle v. Dorrough, 420 U.S. 523, 537 (1975); Ross v. Moffitt, 417 U.S. 600, 610-11 (1974). (The State is fully aware of the federal

constitutional safeguards invoked once a state establishes an appeal procedure, however, Douglas v. California, 372 U.S. 353 (1963). Respondent knows of no authority for the proposition that capital defendants are specifically entitled, under the United States Constitution, to mandatory appellate review or that such review must be done in any required fashion.

The beginning point for analysis of this issue is the holdings of this Court. In Gregg v. Georgia, 428 U.S. 153, 204-06 (1976), the Court approved Georgia's statutory provision for appellate review, as interpreted and applied by the Georgia Supreme Court. The Court also looked at the appellate review procedure in Florida in Proffitt v. Florida, 428 U.S. 242 (1976). The Court noted at 250-51:

The statute provides for automatic review by the Supreme Court of Florida of all cases in which a death sentence has been imposed. § 921.141(4) (Supp. 1976-77). The law differs from that of Georgia in that it does not require the court to conduct any specific form of review. Since, however, the trial judge must justify the imposition of death sentence with written findings, meaningful appellate review of each such sentence is made possible, and the Supreme Court of Florida, like its Georgia counterpart, considers its function to be to "(guarantee) that the (aggravating and mitigating) reasons present in one case will reach a similar result to that reached under similar circumstances in another case. . . . If a defendant is sentenced to die, this Court can review that case in light of the other decisions and determine whether or not the punishment is too great." State v. Dixon, 283 So.2d 1, 10 (1973).

This Court thus approved the Florida review procedure, even though the specifics of the procedure were formulated

by the Florida Supreme Court, rather than by statute. The only difference between the basis for review of the Florida Supreme Court and that of the Arkansas Supreme Court is that appellate review of capital murder cases is not statutorily mandated in Arkansas. As the Arkansas Supreme Court noted in Collins, supra at 240-205 (emphasis in the original), however, it found nothing in the Gregg-Proffitt-Jurek, opinions "which supports a holding that there must be either a mandatory or automatic appeal of a judgment imposing the death penalty or that there must be appellate review which compares cases in which the death penalty has been imposed." The Court added: "It seems to us that the only actual requirement, even of the Stewart plurality, is that a meaningful appellate review is available to ensure that death penalties are not arbitrarily, capriciously or freakishly imposed." After reviewing the numerous judicial review procedures available even at the trial court level, id. at 206-10, the Court stated at 211: "The likelihood that a death penalty would be executed without such an appeal, in the absence of a knowing and intelligent waiver, is highly improbable." The Court then reviewed its past appellate review procedure, as well as its powers to check any arbitrary or freakishly imposed death sentence. Id. at 211-19, 221. Its precise standard of review was set forth, and the Court noted that it was comparable to that approved by the United States Supreme Court pursuant to State v. Dixon, 283 So.2d1 (Fla. 1973). See Proffitt, 428 U.S. at 258 & n.15.

The Arkansas court also noted in Collins, supra that comparative appellate review is obviously not mandatory under the United States Constitution, since the United States Supreme Court held in Gilmore v. Utah, 429 U.S. 1012 (1976), that Gilmore had made a knowing and intelligent waiver of all federal rights while waiving his right to direct appeal of his conviction and death sentence. Collins, 261 Ark. at 205-06.

This Court has apparently never addressed the scope of comparative appellate review of death cases under current State statutes. That issue has, however, been addressed by circuit courts of appeal.

In Baldwin v. Blackburn, 653 F.2d 942, 953 (5th Cir. 1983), the court considered an allegation that the Louisiana Supreme Court's comparative review of death cases was unconstitutional because it was specifically limited by a supreme court rule only to other death cases from that judicial district. The Fifth Circuit held:

The Louisiana Code of Criminal Procedure requires that state supreme court to review every death sentence to see if it is an excessive penalty in the particular case. . . . In pursuit of that duty, procedures have been formulated. . . that require review in each case of the other death sentences imposed in that same judicial district since 1976. The appellant argues that comparative sentence review on less than a statewide basis is not a constitutionally valid sentencing scheme. Appellant purports to derive this principle from cases like Gregg. . . , Proffitt. . . , and Jurek. . . .

The Louisiana scheme to promote evenhanded, rational, and consistent imposition of death sentences provides for a court with state-wide jurisdiction to review each case where the sentence has been imposed and, in turn, satisfy itself that the sentence was not "imposed under the influence of passion, prejudice or any other arbitrary factors, whether the evidence supports the jury's finding of a statutory circumstance, and whether the sentence is disproportionate to the penalty imposed in similar cases, considering both the crime and the defendant." . . . The court further requires the district attorney to file a list of all first degree murder cases occurring within his district having occurred since January 1, 1976, with a synopsis of its facts, the crime convicted of, and sentence imposed. . . . This is in addition to the court's knowledge, jurisdiction, and review of all other murder cases throughout the state. Thus, though the court's scrutiny is directed initially to those murder cases within a given judicial district, the review is not limited to such. (citations omitted)

This holding is particularly relevant here. Not only does the review of the Arkansas Supreme Court go beyond the judicial district from which a defendant is sentenced, the Arkansas court looks at very similar, if not a more comprehensive list of factors, in making its comparative review. Collins, supra at 211-23.

In Baldwin v. Balkcom, 524 F.Supp. 332, 341 (W.D.La. 1981), the District Court upheld the Louisiana comparative review scheme and found it "more than perfunctory."

In Gray v. Lucas, 677 F.2d 1086, 1111 (5th Cir. 1982), the court reviewed the Mississippi Supreme Court's review of death cases. That petitioner alleged that the review was inadequate, as Mr. Collins implies here, because the review did not include cases in which the death penalty had not been

imposed, as well as those in which the defendants were sentenced to death. The Fifth Circuit stated that this Court had specifically rejected a similar argument in Proffitt, 428 U.S. at 258-59 & n.16. See also Barfield v. Harris, 540 F.Supp. 451 473 (E.D.N.C. 1982).

Thus, lower federal courts have upheld appellate reviewing procedures when review is not statutorily mandated, when it is mandated but the details are left to the state supreme court, when that review is limited only to other cases in the same judicial district and when only death cases are compared. Since the Arkansas procedure is even more stringent than that of Louisiana where the procedure is set by supreme court rule, and since it will compare nondeath capital cases when that is appropriate, it meets constitutional standards.

Petitioner's reliance on Sumlin v. State, 273 Ark. 185, 617 S.W.2d 372 (1981), is somewhat confusing to respondent. In that case, the Arkansas Supreme Court reduced the death penalty to life without parole, finding in part that Mr. Sumlin's death sentence was disproportionately imposed because of his co-defendant, his wife, actually committed the murder but received only life without parole. This was not merely a reduction based on comparing the sentences of two co-defendants, however, for it was undisputed that Mr. Sumlin was incarcerated in the Columbia County Jail at the time the murder was committed and participated only in the planning of the murder. The court's reduction of sentence was also based on its finding that there

might have been prejudicial error in the sentencing phase -- the finding by the jury of two aggravating circumstances which the court found to be "redundant." Id., 273 Ark. at 189-90. Whatever else may be said of the case, Sumlin makes it clear that the Arkansas Supreme Court will use as a basis for comparative review the cases it finds appropriately compared in order to ensure that the death penalty is only imposed in a constitutional and, if you will, "fair" manner. It can generally be said that the Arkansas court compares only death cases, but Sumlin illustrates that the court will go beyond that standard for the benefit of a defendant, when that action is reasonable and just.

Petitioner also relies on Henry v. State, 278 Ark. 478, ___ S.W.2d ___ (1983) saying it evidences a lack of standards for comparative review. However, Henry v. State, Id. dealt with the issue of whether accomplice liability warranted a death sentence. As in Sumlin, supra, the Arkansas Supreme Court reduced the death sentence to life imprisonment without parole on that basis saying it did not. This is consistent with this court's holding in Enmond v. Florida, July 2, 1982 50 U.S.L.W. 5087, ___ U.S. ___, (1981).

While the petitioner would contend that his death sentence is disproportionate because of other cases in which the defendants who committed similar crimes received sentences of only life without parole, this Court has not required that kind of comparison. In fact, it noted in Gregg, 428 U.S. at 199:

At each of these stages an actor in the criminal justice system makes a decision which removes a defendant from consideration. . . . Nothing in any of our cases suggests that the decision to afford an individual mercy violates the Constitution.

Further, the allegation that cases in which the death penalty has been imposed must be compared with those in which the defendant received lesser sentences was flatly rejected by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in Gray, relying on Proffitt.

In short, the only way to eliminate the discretion of which the petitioner complains would be to effect a mandatory death penalty for certain rigidly defined crimes committed under equally rigidly defined circumstances. This approach was rejected by the United States Supreme Court in Roberts v. Louisiana, 431 U.S. 133 (1977). This court has held that the states may impose the death penalty under rational and channelled procedures. It has never specified the degree of heinousness of the crime which would justify that penalty and there is nothing in the petitioner's case to suggest a finding that he was underserving of that sentence or that the procedures adopted by the state supreme court for the comparison of his sentence was not followed.

CONCLUSION

Rule 17.1 of the Rules of the Supreme Court states that review on writ of certiorari will only be granted when there are special and important reasons therefore. Subsection (c)

provides that such writs will be granted when a state court has decided a federal question in a way that is in conflict with applicable decisions of this Court or if it has decided an important question of federal law which has not been, but should be, settled by this Court.

Although respondent recognizes that review on writ of certiorari is discretionary, and that the Court is not bound by the guidelines of Rule 17.1(c), it respectfully submits that the Arkansas Supreme Court has followed the applicable decisions of this Court and has properly affirmed the petitioner's conviction on direct appeal.

Therefore, for these reasons and for the reasons and authorities cited in respondent's brief in opposition to the petition for writ of certiorari, respondent respectfully prays that this Court deny review on writ of certiorari.

Respectfully submitted,

STEVE CLARK
Attorney General

BY: MATTHEW WOOD FLEMING
Assistant Attorney General
Justice Building
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201
(501) 371-2007

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Matthew Wood Fleming, Assistant Attorney General, do hereby certify that I have served a copy of the foregoing On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of Arkansas, by mailing a copy of same by U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, to Mr. Jeff Rosenzweig, 310 Three Hundred Spring Building, Little Rock, Arkansas, 72201, Attorney of Record for Petitioner, this 14th day of June, 1983.


MATTHEW WOOD FLEMING

APPENDIX A-1

On cross-appeal the cross-appellant asserts that Missouri Pacific should be required to replace the spur before the Commission hears and acts on the petition. We cannot agree. The cross-appellant has not demonstrated any economic loss by waiting for the Commission's decision. Suffice it to say that, if the spur were restored and the Commission later granted the petition to discontinue the spur, it would result in economic waste. Such a procedure would be an exercise in futility as well as costs to the public being reflected in the rate base or tariff of the statutorily regulated common carrier.

Affirmed on direct and cross-appeal.

T. J. HAYES v. STATE of Arkansas

CR 81-31

625 S.W. 2d 498

Supreme Court of Arkansas
Opinion delivered December 21, 1981

1. CRIMINAL LAW — PRODUCTION OF RECORDS — PREJUDICIAL ERROR FOR STATE AGENCIES TO DENY ACCESS TO MEDICAL RECORDS IN THEIR CUSTODY. — Ark. Stat. Ann. § 41-605 (8) (Repl. 1977) provides that there shall be made available to the examiner and counsel, for inspection and copying, all existing medical records in the custody of public agencies notwithstanding the provisions of any statute enacted prior to the effective date [January 1, 1976] of the code; the Southeast Arkansas Mental Health Center and the State Hospital are public agencies and their records pertaining to the examination of the appellant fall within the scope of this statute. *Held*: It was prejudicial error to deny the appellant access to the agencies' reports.
2. CRIMINAL LAW — EXAMINATION OF DEFENDANT BY PRIVATE PSYCHOLOGIST — STATE NOT REQUIRED TO PROVIDE. — The trial court correctly denied the appellant's petition for an independent, psychological testing and evaluation by a named private psychologist at State expense.
3. CRIMINAL LAW — MATTER ALREADY ESTABLISHED BY OTHER

ARK.]

WITNESSES AT TRIAL INTO SAME MATTER not demonstrated to allow him to incite the police car from officer until the time as such time span prosecutor and vari

4. CRIMINAL LAW — LEDGE OF WITNESS — Where the appellate procedures used by indigent defendant sustained the State the knowledge of
5. CRIMINAL LAW — TO VOLUNTARINESS not determinative freely and volunt
6. CRIMINAL LAW — NESS OF CUSTODI PREPONDERANCE of proving by a preness of a custodi Court makes an totality of circum in doing so, this unless clearly ap
7. CRIMINAL LAW ADMITTED. — "I my girlfriend," into evidence.
8. CRIMINAL LAW CREDIBILITY OF the instant case regarding the vol and where ther request for an a the credibility testimony; mo trial court's fi preponderance
9. CRIMINAL LAW MENTS — NOT duced by the

WITNESSES AT TRIAL — COURT'S REFUSAL TO ALLOW INQUIRY INTO SAME MATTER NOT PREJUDICIAL. — The appellant has not demonstrated that he was prejudiced by the court's refusal to allow him to inquire into the length of time that he spent in the police car from the time he left the county jail with an officer until the time they arrived at the crime scene, inasmuch as such time span had already been established by the deputy prosecutor and various other witnesses.

4. CRIMINAL LAW — INQUIRY INTO PROCEDURE BEYOND KNOWLEDGE OF WITNESS — COURT CORRECTLY SUSTAINED OBJECTION. — Where the appellant tried to cross-examine an officer as to the procedures used by the county sheriff's office when an indigent defendant requests counsel, the court correctly sustained the State's objection since the procedure was beyond the knowledge of the witness.
5. CRIMINAL LAW — WRITTEN OR ORAL CONFESSION — RELEVANCE TO VOLUNTARINESS. — Whether a statement is written or oral is not determinative of whether the appellant's statements were freely and voluntarily made.
6. CRIMINAL LAW — STATE HAS BURDEN OF PROVING VOLUNTARINESS OF CUSTODIAL STATEMENT — STANDARD OF PROOF — PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE. — The State has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence the voluntariness of a custodial statement, and on appeal the Supreme Court makes an independent determination based on the totality of circumstances surrounding the statement; further, in doing so, this Court does not reverse a trial court's finding unless clearly against the preponderance of the evidence.
7. CRIMINAL LAW — SPONTANEOUS STATEMENT — PROPERLY ADMITTED. — The appellant's statement, "I think I just killed my girlfriend," was spontaneous and was properly admitted into evidence.
8. CRIMINAL LAW — CONFLICT IN TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES — CREDIBILITY OF WITNESSES MATTER FOR THE TRIAL COURT. — In the instant case where there was a conflict in the testimony regarding the voluntariness of statements made by the appellant; and where there was conflict in the testimony regarding the request for an attorney, *held*, it was for the trial court to resolve the credibility of the witnesses and any conflict in their testimony; moreover, the Supreme Court cannot say that the trial court's finding of voluntariness is clearly against the preponderance of the evidence.
9. CRIMINAL LAW — NON-USE OF ALLEGED INVOLUNTARY STATEMENTS — NOT PREJUDICIAL. — The appellant was not prejudiced by the non-use of certain statements, alleged to be

involuntary, made by him ten days after his arrest, inasmuch as the statements were repetitious or duplicative of his previous statements.

10. **CRIMINAL PROCEDURE — TERM OF COURT IN WHICH DEFENDANT CHARGED NOT COUNTED IN DETERMINING FULL TERMS OF COURT — NO DENIAL OF RIGHT TO SPEEDY TRIAL UNDER CIRCUMSTANCES.** — The term in which a defendant is charged does not count in determining the full terms of court; therefore, under the facts and circumstances of the case at bar the appellant was not denied his right to a speedy trial. *Held:* The trial court was correct in denying the appellant's motion to dismiss for lack of a speedy trial. [Rule 28, A. R. Crim. P.].
11. **CRIMINAL LAW — ARRAIGNMENT — FAILURE TO ARRAIGN — NOT REVERSIBLE ERROR.** — The mere failure to arraign is not reversible error; however, in the instant case, the appellant has acknowledged that he was arraigned on August 6, 1979; further, at the appellant's request, he was formally arraigned at trial.
12. **EVIDENCE — LIMITATION OF TESTIMONY OF WITNESS — CORRECT UNDER CIRCUMSTANCES.** — Where a witness had observed the appellant drinking heavily on two specific occasions, the latest being two or three days before the alleged offense, *held*, the trial court correctly sustained the State's objection to the testimony since the testimony was not related to the date of the murders; moreover, the appellant has not demonstrated a manifest abuse of discretion by the court.

Appeal from Jefferson Circuit Court, *Randall Williams*, Judge; reversed and remanded.

Ben Johnson, Jr., for appellant.

Steve Clark, Atty. Gen., by: *Victoria L. Fewell*, Asst. Atty. Gen., for appellee.

FRANK HOLT, Justice. A jury found appellant guilty of capital felony murder of two individuals in the same criminal episode (Ark. Stat. Ann. § 41-1501 [Repl. 1977]) and assessed his punishment at death by electrocution. We find merit in appellant's first contention for reversal that the trial court erred in denying him access to the staff reports and records made by the Southeast Arkansas Mental Health Center and the State Hospital in conjunction with court ordered psychiatric and psychological examinations.

On August 15, the court granted a writ of habeas corpus from the local S.A.M.H.C. court, indicated, the court that he had a borderline retardation, the court that he had been tested and evaluated in 1980, from the State's psychiatrist, was found the appellant as being with alcohol addiction. The letter stated that the historical data, from the examining psychiatrist, studies, psychological, psychiatric history, the examining psychiatrist stating that "[c]onfession obtained as provided of jurisdiction and counsel agrees the confession. However, he dis S.A.M.H.C. report

The appellant for release of the necessary for defense lay and professional examinations of Rogers Hall and Center." The trial the scope of discov

Where there defendant, as her provides:

There shall counsel, for ical records standing th

On August 15, 1979, through court appointed counsel, the court granted appellant's request that he be examined at the local S.A.M.H.C. That agency's report, addressed to the court, indicated, *inter alia*, that appellant suffered from borderline retardation, and the examiners recommended to the court that he be sent to the State Hospital for further testing and evaluation. A one page letter dated January 3, 1980, from the State Hospital, signed by an examining psychiatrist, was filed with the court diagnosing the appellant as being without psychosis, although suffering from alcohol addiction and severe antisocial personality. The letter stated that the staff findings were derived from historical data, physical and neurological examinations by the examining physicians, laboratory and other physical studies, psychological assessment by staff psychologists, and psychiatric history and direct psychiatric examination by the examining psychiatrist. The letter report concluded by stating that "[c]opies of supporting documents may be obtained as provided by law upon authorization of the court of jurisdiction and payment of copying costs." Appellant's counsel agrees that he received a copy of this letter report. However, he disputes he ever received a copy of the S.A.M.H.C. reports.

The appellant petitioned the court on March 5, 1980, for release of the psychiatric records, stating "that it is necessary for defendant's defense that he be provided with all lay and professional staff reports compiled in relation to examinations of defendant at the State Mental Hospital, Rogers Hall and the Southeast Arkansas Mental Health Center." The trial judge found this information was outside the scope of discovery and denied the petition.

Where there is a court ordered mental examination of a defendant, as here, Ark. Stat. Ann. § 41-605 (8) (Repl. 1977) provides:

There shall be made available to the examiner and counsel, for inspection and copying, all existing medical records in the custody of public agencies notwithstanding the provisions of any statute enacted prior to

the effective date [Jan. 1, 1976] of the code. (Italics supplied.)

The S.A.M.H.C. and the State Hospital are public agencies and their records pertaining to the examination of the appellant fall within the scope of this statute. In *Westbrook v. State*, 265 Ark. 736, 580 S.W. 2d 702 (1979), the appellant filed a motion to obtain the full records of the State Hospital relating to two prior commitments of the appellant. The motion was granted but the appellant never received the records. In holding the trial court abused its discretion in denying appellant's motion for a continuance until the records were received, we said:

Due to the nature of the defense we feel it was necessary that appellant have these records, if they exist, in order to fully prepare his defense. . . . It may be that something in these records would have enabled appellant to furnish stronger proof on his behalf.

We further stated he was entitled to these records as a matter of law, citing § 41-605 (8), *supra*.

Here, it could be that an inspection and copying of these records and reports would have better enabled the appellant to prepare his defense, or interpose the defense of insanity, or present at trial crucial evidence bearing on mitigation, such as possible mental retardation, during the sentencing phase of the trial. We hold it was prejudicial error to deny him access to these agencies' reports.

Appellant next contends the court erred in denying his petition for an independent psychological testing and evaluation by a named private psychologist at state expense. The court was correct. *Westbrook v. State, supra*; *Andrews v. State*, 265 Ark. 390, 578 S.W. 2d 585 (1979); and *Maxwell v. State*, 259 Ark. 86, 531 S.W. 2d 468 (1976).

Appellant asserts the court erred in limiting cross-examination of two police officers on relevant issues during the Denno hearing. The court refused to allow appellant to inquire into the length of time appellant spent in the police

car from the time they arrived at the scene. Appellant acknowledged the testimony of witnesses who testified that the appellant had been in the car. Appellant has

Appellant's proposed procedures for indigent defense were sustained the court beyond the court noted, securing and. Also, appellant's "line of question

The appellant was removed from an office in the department in question was a general police statement bearing on the question of whether the appellant voluntarily inquired into the trial court's re

The appellant refused to submit to a polygraph test. The statement of the officers, and on the basis of the statement, the court found the appellant's statement was not true. The finding was based on the evidence. *DeLoach v. State*, 265 Ark. 390, 578 S.W. 2d 585 (1979).

The first question was when he was arrested. He wanted "to talk to a lawyer."

car from the time he left the county jail with the officers until they arrived at the crime scene. Since the deputy prosecutor acknowledged the span of time involved and this information was amply elicited through the testimony of various witnesses who established the times and locations at which the appellant made various statements during the afternoon, appellant has not demonstrated he was prejudiced.

Appellant also tried to cross-examine an officer as to the procedures used by the county sheriff's office when an indigent defendant requests counsel. The court correctly sustained the state's objection since the procedure was beyond the knowledge of the witness and, further, as the court noted, the sheriff's office has nothing to do with securing and appointing counsel for indigent defendants. Also, appellant's counsel indicated he was abandoning this "line of questioning."

The appellant further attempted to elicit information from an officer as to the general policy of the sheriff's department in taking statements. The state's objection to the question was correctly sustained. The court ruled that the general policy of the sheriff's office, as to whether a statement be written or oral, is irrelevant to the determination of whether the appellant's statements were freely and voluntarily made. The appellant has failed to show how the trial court's ruling was a manifest abuse of discretion.

The appellant next asserts the trial court erred in refusing to suppress certain statements made by him to police officers. The state has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence the voluntariness of a custodial statement, and on appeal we make an independent determination based on the totality of circumstances surrounding the statement. In doing so, we do not reverse a trial court's finding unless clearly against the preponderance of the evidence. *Degler v. State*, 257 Ark. 388, 517 S.W. 2d 515 (1974).

The first incriminating statement made by appellant was when he walked into the local county jail and stated he wanted "to turn himself in. I think I just killed my girl

friend." This statement was spontaneous. Therefore, it was properly admitted. *Lacy v. State*, 271 Ark. 334, 609 S.W. 2d 13 (1980); and *Little v. State*, 261 Ark. 859, 554 S.W. 2d 312 (1977). Here, after appellant made that statement, he was escorted to a waiting room in the jail. A detective was called in who asked the appellant several questions. The statements made to this detective were suppressed, as the detective could not say for certain that he had advised appellant of his Miranda rights at this time. The detective determined that the homicide probably occurred within the city limits and called the police department. Two officers came to the jail. At the Denno hearing both testified the appellant was read his Miranda rights and he indicated he understood them. There was further testimony that the appellant did not appear intoxicated when he arrived at the county jail. He told these officers he had killed his girl friend and would take them to the scene of the crime. One officer read the appellant his rights again when they entered the police car. Two officers understood that the murder occurred at appellant's girl friend's house, but when they arrived there he became upset and hysterical and told them it happened on the outskirts of the city. Appellant then directed the officers to a location 4½ miles from town where the bodies of the two victims, appellant's girl friend and a cab driver, were found, as well as the cab in which the cab driver, as directed, had transported them. Briefly, the appellant said he had killed the cab driver when he refused to leave the threatened woman, whom he also killed because of his jealousy about her attention to another lover.

At approximately 7:30 p.m. or about four hours after his "walk-in" or spontaneous statement at the jail, the appellant signed a written waiver of his Miranda rights. The officers testified that the appellant indicated, as before, he understood his rights and the meaning of the waiver and freely and voluntarily reiterated his complicity in the alleged murders. Neither did he request an attorney. However, appellant's version was that he was incapable of making a voluntary statement because he had been drinking most of the day and was in a state of hysteria following the alleged offenses. Further, he asked for and was denied an attorney. It was for the trial court to resolve the credibility of the

witnesses and that the trial against the pro *supra*; *Giles v. State*; *Wright v. State*; *Harvey v. State*

The appeal by him on July made and the statements, wh of his previous fail to perceive prejudiced by

The appeal a speedy trial. was tried on Fe terms of court total of 18 mor attributable to charged does court. *Matthew*. In *Kemp v. State* held there are the Jefferson March and on terms for the October, 1979, and ends in Oc 1980, and ends February 5, 19 required unde denying appeal trial.

Neither de erred in failing trial. In an am he acknowled is also the date appellant's rec

witnesses and any conflict in their testimony. We cannot say that the trial court's finding of voluntariness is clearly against the preponderance of the evidence. *Degler v. State, supra*; *Giles v. State*, 261 Ark. 413, 549 S.W. 2d 479 (1977); *Wright v. State*, 267 Ark. 264, 590 S.W. 2d 15 (1979); and *Harvey v. State*, 272 Ark. 19, 611 S.W. 2d 762 (1981).

The appellant also argues that certain statements made by him on July 26, 1979, or ten days later were involuntarily made and the court erred in finding otherwise. These statements, which were somewhat repetitious or duplicative of his previous statements, were not introduced at trial. We fail to perceive nor has appellant demonstrated how he was prejudiced by the non-use of these statements.

The appellant next contends he was denied his right to a speedy trial. Appellant was arrested on July 16, 1979, and was tried on February 5, 1981. Therefore, he argues that four terms of court had elapsed between his arrest and trial or a total of 18 months with only five months of this delay fairly attributable to appellant. The term in which a defendant is charged does not count in determining the full terms of court. *Matthews v. State*, 268 Ark. 484, 598 S.W. 2d 58 (1980). In *Kemp v. State*, 270 Ark. 835, 606 S.W. 2d 573 (1980), we held there are two terms of court for any one year period in the Jefferson County Circuit Court, one that begins in March and one that begins in October. The counting of terms for the purposes of Rule 28 here begins with the October, 1979, term. The second term begins in March, 1980, and ends in October, 1980. The third term begins in October, 1980, and ends in March, 1981. The appellant was tried on February 5, 1981, which is well within the three full terms required under Rule 28. The trial court was correct in denying appellant's motion to dismiss for lack of a speedy trial.

Neither do we agree with appellant that the trial court erred in failing to grant him a plea and arraignment prior to trial. In an amended motion to suppress, dated July 9, 1980, he acknowledged he was arraigned on August 6, 1979, which is also the date that he was appointed counsel. Further, at appellant's request, he was formally arraigned at trial. We

have said that the mere failure to arraign is not reversible error. *Hayden v. State*, 55 Ark. 342, 18 S.W. 239 (1892); and *Ellingburg v. State*, 254 Ark. 199, 492 S.W. 2d 904 (1973).

Appellant's final argument is that the trial court erred in limiting the testimony of Kathie Anderson, during the guilt phase of the trial, about appellant's general drinking habits. The court sustained the state's objection unless the testimony was related to the date of the murders. A brief proffer of proof revealed that Mrs. Anderson had observed appellant drinking heavily on two specific occasions, the latest being two or three days before the alleged offenses. The appellant has not demonstrated a manifest abuse of discretion by the court.

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 11 (f), Ark. Stat. Ann. Vol. 3A (Repl. 1977), we have reviewed the transcript for rulings adverse to appellant and find no other error prejudicial to his rights.

Reversed and remanded.

William C. ALLTON v. Sue Ann SUMTER &
Donald Ray SUMTER, Husband and Wife

81-155

625 S.W. 2d 502

Supreme Court of Arkansas
Opinion delivered December 21, 1981

1. ADOPTION — STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS — EFFECT OF SAVINGS CLAUSE. — The trial court incorrectly applied the statute of limitations under Ark. Stat. Ann. § 56-216 (b) (Supp. 1981) under circumstances where the adoption petition, in issue, was filed June 15, 1977, a temporary order of adoption was entered October, 1977, a final order was entered May 23, 1978, and the appellant's petition to set aside the adoption was filed August, 1980, inasmuch as Ark. Stat. Ann. § 56-216 (b) (Supp. 1981) became effective July 5, 1977, after the petition for adoption was filed in the case; moreover, the new statute

Ark.]

has a saving termination Act are not a 735.]

2. ADOPTION — NOTICE — STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS — fully deprived adoption proceedings tolled when action exists.

Appeal from
berger, Judge; n

Niblock &
lant.

Elrod & Le

DARRELL F.
adoption decre
natural father
Sumter, the boy
married Donald
to Arkansas in
Charles Allton
to Ark. Stat. A
these proceedin
the adoption in
1980, to set asi
the one year sta
Ark. Stat. Ann
effective on Ju
challenge to ar
within one year

On appeal
the trial judge
law which had
been applied; a
unconstitution

APPENDIX A-2

Carl Albert COLLINS *v.* STATE of Arkansas

CR 75-110

548 S.W. 2d 106

Opinion delivered March 7, 1977

(In Banc)

1. CRIMINAL LAW — DEATH PENALTY STATUTE — CONSTITUTIONALITY. — Act 438, Ark. Acts of 1973, Title 41, Chap. 47 (Supp. 1973), is constitutional and valid.
2. CRIMINAL LAW — DEATH BY ELECTROCUTION — NOT UNCONSTITUTIONALLY CRUEL. — Death by electrocution is not unconstitutional cruel.
3. CRIMINAL LAW — DEATH PENALTY — NOT CRUEL & UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT. — The death penalty is not per se cruel and unusual punishment prohibited by the Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution.
4. STATUTES — CONSTITUTIONALITY — PRESUMPTION. — There is a strong presumption of constitutionality appurtenant to every legislative enactment unless it appears upon its face to be within a specific prohibition, such as one of those in the first ten amendments to the United States Constitution.
5. CRIMINAL LAW — CAPITAL FELONY MURDER, STATUTORY DEFINITION OF — CONSTITUTIONALITY. — The statutory definition of capital felony murder strictly limits the homicidal offenses for which the death penalty may be imposed and this limitation is constitutionally adequate. [Ark. Stat. Ann. §§ 41-4701, 41-4702 (Supp. 1973).]
6. CRIMINAL LAW — DEATH SENTENCE — NOT MANDATORY. — The imposition of the death sentence is not mandatory in any case, for the jury may find mitigating circumstances which outweigh any aggravating circumstances it finds to exist. [Ark. Stat. Ann. §§ 41-4703, 41-4710, 41-4712 (Supp. 1973).]
7. CRIMINAL LAW — DEATH PENALTY — APPELLATE REVIEW, AVAILABILITY OF REQUIRED. — The United States Supreme Court requires that a *meaningful* appellate review be available to insure that death penalties are not arbitrarily, capriciously, or freakishly imposed, but does not require that there *must* either be a mandatory or automatic appeal of a judgment imposing the death penalty or that there *must* be appellate review which compares cases in which the death penalty has been imposed.
8. CRIMINAL LAW — STATUTES, SUFFICIENCY OF — SENTENCING AUTHORITY, GUIDELINES FURNISHED TO. — Arkansas statutes clearly insure the meeting of the requirements that the sentencing authority be given adequate information relevant to im-

finding that sufficient aggravating circumstances existed or that there were not sufficient mitigating circumstances to outweigh the aggravating circumstances, but there was sufficient evidence to support the finding of guilt.

17. **CRIMINAL LAW — RULE 37, ARK. RULES OF CRIM. PROC. — POST-CONVICTION RELIEF.** — The power of the trial court may be exercised after conviction by the granting of post-conviction relief under appropriate circumstances under Rule 37, Ark. Rules of Crim. Proc., which existed in substantially the same form as Crim. Proc. Rule 1 at the time of trial and judgment in this case; the arbitrary, capricious, wanton or freakish imposition of the death penalty would seem to be a ground for modification of a death sentence on post-conviction relief on the ground that it was imposed in violation of the Constitution and laws of the United States or of this state or that it was in excess of the maximum authorized by law or that it was otherwise subject to collateral attack.
18. **CRIMINAL LAW — DEATH PENALTY CASES — NO MANDATORY APPELLATE REVIEW.** — While there is no mandatory appellate review in Arkansas, the likelihood that a death penalty would be executed without such an appeal, in the absence of a knowing and intelligent waiver, is highly improbable, since the trial judge must advise the defendant of his right to appeal and defendant's attorney has the responsibility to explain to him the meaning and consequences of the judgment and advise him of his right to appeal; and, under present rules, defense counsel may not withdraw from the case after notice of appeal is given without permission of the Supreme Court, and any person convicted of a felony in a circuit court of this state has the right to appeal to the Supreme Court.
19. **CRIMINAL LAW — SUPREME COURT — POWER TO MODIFY JUDGMENT AND REDUCE PUNISHMENT.** — The Supreme Court has the power to reduce the punishment, including a death penalty, from that imposed by a circuit court for a higher degree of an offense than the evidence will support to the punishment for that degree which the evidence will support, and the Supreme Court is empowered by statute to modify the judgment or order appealed from and enter such judgment as the Court may, in its discretion, deem just. [Ark. Stat. Ann. § 27-2144 (Repl. 1962) and § 43-2725.2 (Supp. 1975).]
20. **COLLINS — SUPREME COURT — POWER TO REDUCE SENTENCE.** — The statute empowering the Supreme Court to reduce a sentence if it is deemed excessive has been construed to preserve the distinction between executive clemency and appropriate judicial review of a sentence where there is error pertaining to the sentence. [Ark. Stat. Ann. § 43-2725.2 (Supp. 1975).]

21. CRIMINAL LAW — CRUEL & UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT — CONSTITUTIONAL BAN. — The constitutional ban of cruel and unusual punishment is directed against the character of the punishment and not its duration.
22. APPEAL & ERROR — CAPITAL OFFENSES & LIFE FELONIES — REQUIREMENTS OF APPELLATE COURT. — In capital offenses and life felonies, all errors of the lower court prejudicial to the rights of appellant are required to be heard and considered by the Supreme Court and if any prejudicial error is found the Supreme Court is required to reverse and remand the cause for a new trial or modify the judgment.
23. APPEAL & ERROR — INSTRUCTIONS TO JURY, DEFICIENCY IN — REVERSIBLE ERROR. — Error in failure to properly instruct the jury with reference to punishments that it might impose has been held to be reversible, even though defendant did not request such an instruction.
24. APPEAL & ERROR — SUPREME COURT — RIGHT, POWER & DUTY TO REDUCE PUNISHMENT. — The Supreme Court has the right, power and duty to reduce the punishment in any case where there is any indication that it resulted from passion and prejudice.
25. APPEAL & ERROR — SUPREME COURT — POWER TO REDUCE DEATH PENALTY BECAUSE OF MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES. — The Supreme Court may reduce the punishment, even where the evidence was sufficient to support the verdict of guilt of the proper crime or degree of crime, but the jury failed to consider mitigating circumstances, even where the defendant has been sentenced to death.
26. CRIMINAL LAW — PUNISHMENT — WHEN CRUEL & UNUSUAL. — Punishment is cruel and unusual when it is so wholly disproportionate to the nature of the offense as to shock the moral sense of the community.
27. CRIMINAL LAW — DEATH PENALTY STATUTE, CONSTITUTIONALITY OF — SAFEGUARDS AGAINST WRONGFUL IMPOSITION. — The Arkansas system of prosecuting and sentencing those found guilty of a charge of capital felony murder provides adequate safeguards against arbitrary, capricious, or freakish imposition of the death penalty to successfully pass constitutional examination in the light of the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendment standards as ascertainable from recent United States Supreme Court decisions.
28. CRIMINAL LAW — BIFURCATED TRIAL — JURY, DUTY IN FIRST PHASE OF TRIAL. — In the first phase of a bifurcated trial in which a guilty verdict for the offense of capital felony murder may be returned, the jury making the determination must find unanimously that the accused is guilty of one of the narrowly defined categories of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt.

29. CRIMINAL LAW — BIFURCATED TRIAL — SENTENCING PHASE. — In the second or sentencing phase of a bifurcated trial, the jury which has returned the guilty verdict may hear testimony tending to show aggravating and mitigating circumstances, but the death penalty cannot be imposed unless the jury unanimously finds, beyond a reasonable doubt, that one or more aggravating circumstances exist, specifies in writing which of them does exist, and finds that aggravating circumstances outweigh the mitigating circumstances found to exist.
30. CRIMINAL LAW — TRIAL — SENTENCING. — Before pronouncement of the death sentence and entry of judgment, the trial judge may consider appropriate matters of mitigation, and any other matters appropriate, both favorable and adverse, to the defendant.
31. TRIAL — GROUNDS FOR NEW TRIAL — RIGHT OF DEFENDANT TO SHOW. — The defendant must be given the opportunity to show any of the recognized grounds for a new trial, among which are: (1) the verdict is contrary to the law or the evidence; (2) misconduct of the jury; and (3) the defendant has not, in the opinion of the judge, received a fair and impartial trial.
32. COURTS — TRIAL JUDGE, DISCRETION OF BROAD — VERDICT, MAY SET ASIDE. — The latitude of the trial judge's discretion is broad, he may set aside a verdict when he is satisfied the ends of justice would be thereby served and should do so where he has reason to believe it is the result of passion, prejudice or any factor other than a calm consideration of the facts in evidence or if the judge finds, for any reason, that the circumstances of the case do not warrant the imposition of the death penalty.
33. APPEAL & ERROR — APPELLATE REVIEW — MATTERS INCLUDED. — Appellate review includes (1) a determination of whether the sentence was the result of passion, prejudice, or any arbitrary factor; (2) whether the evidence supports the jury's finding of any statutory aggravating circumstances; (3) whether the evidence supports the jury's findings on the question of whether mitigating circumstances outweigh aggravating ones; and (4) whether the sentence is excessive.
34. CRIMINAL LAW — COMPARISON OF SENTENCES — OPPORTUNITY. — While there is no specific requirement that the Supreme Court compare sentences in other cases, it must necessarily consult prior cases as precedent in determining whether there was error, and, since the jury's findings with respect to the various aggravating or mitigating circumstances must be in writing, the basis for its verdict will be known and can be compared with the punishment in other cases.
35. CRIMINAL LAW — DEATH PENALTY, SAFEGUARD AGAINST IMPOSITION OF — GOVERNOR, POWER OF TO COMMUTE SENTENCE. — In

addition to the powers and responsibilities of the judicial system, the Arkansas system of checks and balances provides for an additional safeguard as a check against the arbitrary, capricious, freakish, or wanton imposition of the death penalty in the executive branch by vesting in the Governor the power to commute a sentence. [Ark. Const., Art. 6, § 18.]

On remand from the Supreme Court of the United States; affirmed.

John Barry Baker and Robert R. Estes, for appellant.

Jim Guy Tucker, Atty. Gen., by: *Robert A. Newcomb*, Asst. Atty. Gen., for appellee.

JOHN A. FOGLEMAN, Justice. The judgment sentencing appellant Carl Albert Collins to death by electrocution under Act 438 of 1973 (Ark. Stat. Ann., Title 41, Chap. 47, Supp. 1973) was affirmed by this court on December 22, 1975. See *Collins v. State*, 259 Ark. 8, 531 S.W. 2d 13. Thereafter, petition for writ of certiorari for review of our judgment affirming the judgment of the Circuit Court of Washington County was filed in the Supreme Court of the United States. That court, on October 4, 1976, vacated our judgment, insofar as it left undisturbed the death penalty imposed, and ordered that this cause be remanded to this court for further consideration in light of *Gregg v. Georgia*, 428 U.S. 153, 96 S. Ct. 2909, 49 L. Ed. 2d 859 (1976); *Proffitt v. Florida*, 428 U.S. 242, 96 S. Ct. 2960, 49 L. Ed. 2d 913 (1976); *Jurek v. Texas*, 428 U.S. 262, 96 S. Ct. 2950, 49 L. Ed. 2d 929 (1976); *Woodson and Waxton v. North Carolina*, 428 U.S. 280, 96 S. Ct. 2978, 49 L. Ed. 2d 944 (1976); and *Roberts v. Louisiana*, 428 U.S. 325, 96 S. Ct. 3001, 49 L. Ed. 2d 974 (1976). The mandate remanding the case was issued on November 16, 1976 and filed here on November 18, 1976.

Our consideration of the imposition of the death penalty in this case (the only part of our judgment that was vacated), in the light of these decisions, leads us to the same conclusions we reached when the case was previously considered, i.e., that the statute under which the death penalty was imposed is constitutional and valid, that the pertinent issues were properly submitted to the jury, whose verdict was sustained by the evidence; and that death by electrocution is

not unconstitutionally cruel. We adopt our earlier opinion in this case and reiterate all that we there said. Fundamentally, our present consideration is concerned with determining whether the death penalty statute under which appellant Collins was sentenced¹ falls within the constitutional perimeter discernible from the 1976 quintuplet offspring of *Furman v. Georgia*, 408 U.S. 238, 92 S. Ct. 2726, 33 L. Ed. 2d 346 (1972).

Our review is not simplified by the same multiplicity of opinions in these cases that we found in *Furman*; however, our principal consideration must of necessity be directed toward the opinions of the Stewart-Powell-Stevens plurality (hereinafter referred to as the Stewart plurality) in *Gregg*, *Proffitt* and *Jurek*, because from our analysis, the participation of at least one member of this plurality was essential to the sustention of the death penalty in those three cases. In viewing the statute under which appellant was sentenced, we cannot forget, however, that these opinions are not majority opinions in any of the three cases. It is important that we keep in mind what the Stewart plurality does not say while tracing what it does say. Let us first note, however, certain definite conclusions we find from reading all the opinions in all the five cases in the light of which we are mandated to review our holding in this case. They are:

1. The death penalty is not per se cruel and unusual punishment prohibited by the Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution.
2. Imposition of a death penalty pursuant to a law imposing a mandatory death penalty for a broad category of homicidal offenses constitutes cruel and unusual punishment prohibited by the Eighth Amendment.
3. Each distinct system permitting the imposition of the death penalty for a criminal offense must be examined to determine whether it violates Eighth Amendment

¹This statute was substantially incorporated into the Arkansas Criminal Code of 1976. We point out some differences in an Appendix to this opinion. Although we find no significance in them, our evaluation in that respect is based upon a superficial examination, as the statute in its present state is not under review here.

prohibitions against cruel and unusual punishment.

4. The basic concern, expressed in *Furman v. Georgia*, supra, centered on defendants who were being condemned to death capriciously and arbitrarily.

5. Facially the procedures in Georgia, Florida and Texas satisfy the Eighth Amendment requirement. Those in North Carolina and Louisiana do not.

The Supreme Court of the United States did nothing more in the *Furman* offspring than consider each of the statutes of the five respondent states to determine whether the particular state afforded adequate safeguards against the capricious and freakish imposition of the death penalty. See *State v. Bayless*, 48 Ohio State 2d 73, 357 N.E. 2d 1035 (1976). Our analysis of our own procedures leads us to the conclusion that the death sentence was constitutionally imposed in this case.

We approach the consideration of the question before us mindful of the strong presumption of constitutionality appurtenant to every legislative enactment, unless it appears upon its face to be within a specific prohibition, such as one of those in the first ten amendments to the United States Constitution. *Stone v. State*, 254 Ark. 1011, 498 S.W. 2d 634; *Williams v. State*, 253 Ark. 973, 490 S.W. 2d 117; *Neal v. Still*, 248 Ark. 1132, 455 S.W. 2d 921; *Dabbs v. State*, 39 Ark. 353, 43 Am. Rep. 275; *San Antonio School District v. Rodriguez*, 411 U.S. 1, 93 S. Ct. 1278, 36 L. Ed. 2d 16 (1973), also, Stewart, J., concurring p. 79. See also, plurality opinion, *Lemon v. Kurtzman*, 411 U.S. 192, 93 S. Ct. 1463, 36 L. Ed. 2d 151 (1973), citing Stewart, J., concurring in *Rodriguez*; *Schlib v. Kuebel*, 404 U.S. 357, 92 S. Ct. 479, 30 L. Ed. 2d 502 (1971); *McDonald v. Board of Election Com.*, 394 U.S. 802, 89 S. Ct. 1404, 22 L. Ed. 2d 739 (1969); *McGowan v. Maryland*, 366 U.S. 420, 81 S. Ct. 1101, 6 L. Ed. 2d 393 (1961); *United States v. Carolene Products Co.*, 304 U.S. 144, 58 S. Ct. 778, 82 L. Ed. 1234 (1938); *Fleming v. Nestor*, 363 U.S. 603, 80 S. Ct. 1367, 4 L. Ed. 2d 1435 (1960); *New York v. O'Neill*, 359 U.S. 1, 79 S. Ct. 564, 3 L. Ed. 2d 585 (1959); *Alaska Packers Association v. Industrial Accident Com.*, 294 U.S. 532, 55 S. Ct. 518, 79 L. Ed. 1044 (1935); *Borden's Farm Products Co. v. Balduin*, 293 U.S. 194, 55 S. Ct. 187, 79 L. Ed. 281 (1933).

We need not spend a great deal of time on such features of the Arkansas statute as the definition of the crime for which the death penalty may be imposed and the bifurcated trial. Since the crime in this case was murder, we view the statute only as it pertains to homicides. It is crystal clear that insofar as homicide is concerned there are under this statute several degrees all included (or potentially so) in capital felony.² They are:

Capital felony murder.

Life felony murder.

Felony murder in the first degree. See Ark. Stat. Ann. §§ 41-2201, 2205 (Repl. 1964).

Felony murder in the second degree. See Ark. Stat. Ann. §§ 41-2201, 2206 (Repl. 1964).

Voluntary manslaughter. See Ark. Stat. Ann. §§ 41-2207, 2208 (Repl. 1964).

Involuntary manslaughter. See Ark. Stat. Ann. §§ 41-2207, 2209 (Repl. 1964).

Negligent homicide. See Ark. Stat. Ann. § 75-1101 (Repl. 1957).

The definition of capital felony murder strictly limits the homicidal offenses for which the death penalty may be imposed. Ark. Stat. Ann. §§ 41-4701, 4702 (Supp. 1973). This limitation seems constitutionally adequate. *Jurek v. Texas*, supra. The imposition of the death sentence is not mandatory in any case, for the jury may find mitigating circumstances which outweigh any aggravating circumstances it finds to exist. Ark. Stat. Ann. §§ 41-4703, 4710, 4712 (Supp. 1973). The statute provides adequate guidelines, so limiting and directing the exercise of the jury's discretion that an arbitrary, capricious, wanton or freakish exercise of that discretion is improbable. *Gregg v. Georgia*, supra; *Proffitt v. Florida*, supra; *Jurek v. Texas*, supra; *Collins v. State*, supra. See also, *Neal v. State*, 259 Ark. 27, 531 S.W. 2d 17. Cf. *Woodson v. North Carolina*, supra; *Roberts v. Louisiana*, supra. The Arkansas statutes applicable here require that the sentencing authority focus on the particularized nature of the crime, just as the law

²For the purposes of this opinion, it is unnecessary to consider other homicides characterized as murder. See, e.g., §§ 41-2211, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226 (Repl. 1964).

did in Georgia, Florida and Texas. Ark. Stat. Ann. §§ 41-4702, 41-4712 (Supp. 1973). The bifurcated trial mandated by our statutes in effect at the time of appellant's trial [Ark. Stat. Ann. §§ 41-4710 — 41-4713 (Supp. 1973)] seems to have been approved, although not required. The aggravating and mitigating circumstances that may be considered under our statute seem to meet constitutional muster. Ark. Stat. Ann. § 41-4711, 4712 (Supp. 1973). See *Gregg v. Georgia*, *supra*; *Proffitt v. Florida*, *supra*.

It is urged, however, that our system does not meet *Gregg-Proffitt-Jurek* standards necessary to avoid Eighth and Fourteenth Amendment prohibitions for lack of a mandatory appeal of a judgment imposing the death penalty and of appellate review which compares cases in which the death penalty has been imposed.

We find nothing in any opinion, and certainly no majority, which supports a holding that there *must* be either a mandatory or automatic appeal of a judgment imposing the death penalty or that there *must* be appellate review which compares cases in which the death penalty has been imposed. We again point out that the Supreme Court of the United States did nothing more than consider the statutes of each of five states to determine whether there were sufficient safeguards against the capricious and freakish imposition of the death penalty. It is true that the Stewart plurality found that, in addition to bifurcated trial with sentencing dependent upon a jury's or trial judge's findings as to aggravating or mitigating circumstances, appellate review is an important safeguard, when that review is for error and appropriateness of the sentence, and to determine whether: the sentence was imposed under the influence of passion and prejudice or any arbitrary factor; the evidence supports the jury's or judge's finding of statutory aggravating circumstances; the sentence is excessive or disproportionate to the penalty imposed in similar cases, considering both the crime and the defendant. *Gregg v. Georgia*, *supra*.

The North Carolina death penalty statute seems to have fallen because there was no way for the state judiciary, through appellate review, to check the arbitrary and

capricious exercise of the power of the jury to determine who shall live or die. *Woodson v. North Carolina*, supra. See also, *Roberts v. Louisiana*, supra. It seems to us that the only actual requirement, even of the Stewart plurality, is that a meaningful appellate review is available to insure that death penalties are not arbitrarily, capriciously or freakishly imposed. The important question is whether the system creates a substantial risk of arbitrariness or caprice.

It is significant that in *Jurek*, some of the federal constitutional requirements were found to have been met by a state supreme court interpretation of the Texas capital sentencing act which would permit evidence of mitigating circumstances and appellate review of the sufficiency of the evidence to support the jury's answers to questions relating to statutory questions required in the sentencing phase of a bifurcated trial. True enough, the opinion states that Texas law provides for an expedited appeal.³ Nothing whatever is said about comparison of sentences.

The idea that in *Gregg*, *Proffitt*, and *Jurek*, the United States Supreme Court has held that there must be a mandatory or automatic appeal from the imposition of the death penalty by a state trial court seems to have crumbled with the recent actions of the court in *Gilmore v. State of Utah*, 429 U.S. 1012, 97 S. Ct. 436, 50 L. Ed. 2d 632 (1976), in which, on December 13, 1976, that court found that Gary Mark Gilmore, who had been sentenced to death, made a knowing and intelligent waiver of any and all federal rights he might have had. In a concurring opinion by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Powell, it is clearly pointed out that Gilmore had waived his right of appeal under state law, and the history of that waiver is recited. True enough, the order of the United States Supreme Court (White, Brennan, Marshall and Blackmun dissenting) does not specifically refer to this waiver. It does, however, state:

*** that the State's determinations of his competence knowingly and intelligently to waive any and all such rights were firmly grounded.

³The Texas Court had pointed out that the Texas statute provided for automatic, swift and mandatory appellate review. *Jurek v. State*, Tex. Cr. App., 522 S.W. 2d 934 (1975).

If the Constitution of the United States requires that a state provide a mandatory appeal in such cases, we do not see how there can be a knowing and intelligent waiver of "any and all federal rights" when there has been no appeal from the state trial court's judgment imposing the death sentence. In any event, the Stewart plurality has said that it had no intention to suggest that the procedures approved in *Gregg* would be the only ones permissible under *Furman* or that a system constructed on these general lines would inevitably satisfy *Furman*; but that each system must be examined on an individual basis. *Gregg v. Georgia*, *supra*.

Most of the major concerns of the United States Supreme Court can be met by a statute that insures that the sentencing authority is given adequate information relevant to imposition of sentence and provided with standards to guide its use of that information. Our statutes clearly insure the meeting of these requirements at the jury trial. But another concern of the Stewart plurality is the existence of an adequate power in the judiciary to check the arbitrary and capricious exercise of the power of the jury to impose the death penalty. Our system supplies considerable protection against the arbitrary, capricious or freakish imposition of the death sentence.⁴ It does not suffer from the deficiencies found in *Furman*. The Arkansas judiciary is vested with broad powers to check the arbitrary, capricious, wanton or freakish imposition of the death sentence by a jury. Those powers exist at both trial and appellate levels.

The trial judge is not required to impose the death penalty in every case in which the jury verdict prescribes it. Upon return of a verdict of guilty in any felony case, the entry of judgment may be postponed by the trial court for not more than 30 days. During this time probation reports may be submitted, and matters of mitigation, or any other matter the court or the defendant may deem appropriate to consider before the pronouncement of sentence and the entry of formal judgment may be presented. Ark. Stat. Ann. § 43-2301 (Supp. 1973, Supp. 1975). We have said that the trial judge

⁴A statement by the Nebraska Supreme Court might well be applied here. "No longer will one man die and another live on the basis of race, or a woman live and a man die on the basis of sex." *State v. Stewart*, 197 Neb. 497, 250 N.W. 2d 849 (1977).

in imposing sentence should have the benefit of all available information about the defendant, both favorable and adverse. *Meyers v. State*, 252 Ark. 367, 479 S.W. 2d 238. See also, *Hudspeth v. State*, 188 Ark. 323, 67 S.W. 2d 191. When the defendant appears for sentencing, he must be asked if he has any legal cause why sentence should not be pronounced against him. Ark. Stat. Ann. § 43-2302 (Repl. 1964). He may show for cause against the judgment any sufficient ground for new trial or for arrest of judgment. Ark. Stat. Ann. § 43-2304 (Repl. 1964). Denial of the right of allocution is error. *Tate v. State*, 258 Ark. 135, 524 S.W. 2d 624, 726 (opinion on rehearing). The trial court has power to modify any unexecuted sentence and its own judgment at any time during the term of court in which it was rendered. *Charles v. State*, 256 Ark. 690, 510 S.W. 2d 68; *Emerson v. Boyles*, 170 Ark. 621, 280 S.W. 1005.

The trial court has the power, in its discretion, to reduce a death sentence to life imprisonment, or to grant a new trial. *Black v. State*, 215 Ark. 618, 222 S.W. 2d 816, cert. den. 338 U.S. 956, 70 S. Ct. 490, 94 L. Ed. 590. See also, Ark. Stat. Ann. § 43-2310 (Repl. 1964). Ark. Stat. Ann. § 43-2203 (Repl. 1964) is pertinent to the right of allocution, because it sets out permissible grounds for new trial where rights of a defendant have been prejudiced. Among them are cases where the verdict is against law and evidence and where from the misconduct of the jury or any other cause, the court is of the opinion that the defendant has not received a fair and impartial trial.⁵

In considering grounds for a new trial, powers of the trial judge are great and the latitude of his discretion broad, and have always been, in this state. In *Oliver v. State*, 34 Ark. 632, where a verdict of manslaughter had been returned, this court spoke of the powers and duties of circuit judges in this regard:

⁵A motion for new trial is not a requisite for appellate review, but it is still permitted at any time prior to the time fixed for filing notice of appeal and has the effect of extending the time allowed for filing notice of appeal. Ark. Stat. Ann. §§ 43-2703, 43-2704 (Supp. 1973, Supp. 1975). We have also held that a motion for new trial may be heard and granted by a trial court after notice of appeal has been given and before the record has been filed in this court. *State v. Addison*, 251 Ark. 119, 471 S.W. 2d 332.

*** They preside in the courts and take personal cognizance of all that occurs in the progress of causes. It is their duty to see that juries do not transcend the proper limits of their authority, and that all trials are fair and in accordance with law. The circuit judge has the discretion to grant new trials in all cases where he is satisfied that the ends of justice will be best subserved thereby, and should not hesitate to exercise it where he is dissatisfied with a verdict, as having reason to believe it the result of excitement, passion, prejudice, or any other influence save a calm consideration of the facts in evidence.

The presiding circuit judge must necessarily have a wide discretion to set aside a verdict where, in his judgment, it was tainted by passion, sympathy, prejudice, corruption, or any other sinister influence, and therefore was not responsive to the law and the evidence; and his exercise of that discretion will not be interfered with on appeal unless there has been an abuse of discretion. *Freels v. State*, 130 Ark. 189, 196 S.W. 913.

Although the right to fix punishment is primarily a duty enjoined upon juries, we have recognized, in a case where the death penalty was imposed and sustained, that in cases where the evidence does not sustain the degree of crime expressed in the jury verdict, but does support a lower degree, a plea for partial relief by reducing the sentence to life imprisonment can be granted. *Hildreth v. State*, 215 Ark. 808, 223 S.W. 2d 757. Even though we spoke in that case primarily to the power of this court, what we said applies equally to the power of the trial judge to reduce a penalty of death to one of life imprisonment without parole where the evidence does not support the jury verdict on the sentencing phase of the trial. There can be no doubt about the trial court's power in this respect. Ark. Stat. Ann. § 43-2310 (Repl. 1964) provides:

Reduction of verdict. — The court shall have power, in all cases of conviction, to reduce the extent or duration of the punishment assessed by a jury, if, in the opinion of the court, the conviction is proper, and the punishment assessed is greater than under the circumstances of the case, ought to be inflicted, so that the punishment be

not, in any case, reduced below the limit prescribed by law in such cases.

See also, *Tabor v. State*, 246 Ark. 983, 440 S.W. 2d 536.

In practice we have regarded this statute as giving the trial judge an opportunity to review the sentence, from his superior ability to evaluate facts, afforded by seeing and hearing the parties and witnesses and knowing the trial atmosphere, as he would weigh the evidence in considering a motion for new trial. The Missouri Supreme Court has given similar treatment to a virtually identical statute in that state. *State v. Rigor*, 353 Mo. 368, 182 S.W. 2d 525 (1944). Like that court, we have often treated the extent and duration of the punishment as a cognizable question on appeal where there was evidence of passion and prejudice.

If the evidence proves insufficient to support a jury's verdict of a higher offense, the trial court may sentence the defendant for a lesser included offense where the evidence clearly shows the commission of the latter (and this court, in its discretion, may reduce the sentence to that prescribed for the lesser offense). *Caton v. State*, 252 Ark. 420, 479 S.W. 2d 537. This rule applies in murder cases as well as for other felonies. *Simpson v. State*, 56 Ark. 8, 19 S.W. 99. Even when there was no distinction in different types of murder for which the death penalty, or at the discretion of the jury, life imprisonment, could be imposed, the death penalty was treated by this court as if it were a higher degree of murder in the first degree than murder in the first degree when the death penalty was not imposed. *Sneed v. State*, 159 Ark. 65, 255 S.W. 895. The rationale for doing so is even greater under the statutes in effect at the time appellant was sentenced. Previously, the death sentence was mandatory, unless the jury, at its discretion, decided to impose life imprisonment instead. Ark. Stat. Ann. §§ 41-2227, 43-2611, 43-2153 (Repl. 1964). Under the statute in effect when Collins was tried, there is a clear delineation of separate degrees of crime, i.e., capital felony, life felony without parole, life felony and felony. Ark. Stat. Ann. § 41-4701 (Supp. 1973). Capital felonies are clearly defined and limited. Ark. Stat. Ann. § 41-

4702 (Supp. 1973). The next lesser included offense is life felony without parole, which differs from capital felony only in that there are mitigating circumstances, which are expressly stated.⁶ Ark. Stat. Ann. §§41-4703, 4712 (Supp. 1973). The next lesser degree is life felony, which includes all crimes for which life imprisonment or the death penalty had been formerly prescribed. Ark. Stat. Ann. § 41-4704 (Supp. 1973). All other crimes were felonies. Ark. Stat. Ann. § 41-4705 (Supp. 1973).

Thus, it is quite clear that the trial judge has the power and the duty to reduce the punishment from that for capital felony to that for life felony or any of the other degrees of homicide, if he finds the evidence insufficient to support the higher degree of homicide and sufficient only to support the lesser degree. Thus, if he found there was no sufficient evidence to support the jury's finding on any aggravating circumstance enumerated in §41-4711, and that there was not sufficient evidence to support its finding that sufficient aggravating circumstances existed or that there were not sufficient mitigating circumstances to outweigh the aggravating circumstances, but there was sufficient evidence to support the finding of guilt, he should impose a sentence of life imprisonment without parole as punishment for the lesser degree of homicide, life felony without parole. Ark. Stat. Ann. § 41-4710 (Supp. 1973).

The power of the trial court may be exercised at an even later stage in the criminal justice process. Post-conviction relief may be granted, under appropriate circumstances, by the trial court under Rule 37 of the Arkansas Rules of Criminal Procedure, which would apply today, but which existed at the time of the trial and judgment in this case in substantially identical form as Criminal Procedure Rule 1 [Vol. 3A, Ark. Stat. Ann. (Supp. 1973, Supp. 1975)]. The arbitrary, capricious, wanton or freakish imposition of the death penalty would seem to be a ground for modification of a sentence to death on the ground that it was imposed in violation of the Constitution and laws of the United States or of this state or that it was in excess of the maximum authorized by law or that it was otherwise subject to collateral attack.

⁶Perhaps the mitigating circumstances were not limited to those stated. Cf. Ark. Stat. Ann. §§ 41-4712 and 41-4711 (Supp. 1973).

Concededly, there is no mandatory appellate review in Arkansas. The likelihood that a death penalty would be executed without such an appeal, in the absence of a knowing and intelligent waiver, is highly improbable. At the time the sentence is announced and judgment is entered thereon, the trial judge *must* advise the defendant of his right to appeal. Ark. Stat. Ann. § 43-2301 (Supp. 1973, Supp. 1975). Defense counsel also has the responsibility for explaining to the defendant the meaning and consequences of the judgment and advising him of his right to appeal. American Bar Association Standards for Criminal Justice, The Prosecution and Defense Function, Part VIII, § 8.2. See also, American Bar Association Standards, Post Conviction Remedies, § 4.4 (b) (Approved Draft, 1968). Under present rules, defense counsel may not withdraw from the case after notice of appeal is given without permission of this court. Rule 36.26 Rules of Criminal Procedure; Rule 9, Rules of Circuit and Chancery Courts. Any person convicted of a felony in a circuit court of this state has the right of appeal to this court. Ark. Stat. Ann. § 43-2701 (Supp. 1973, Supp. 1975). Notice of appeal must be filed with the trial court within 30 days from the date of sentencing and entry of judgment, unless a motion for new trial is earlier filed in which case, the time for filing notice of appeal does not expire until 30 days after the motion has been disposed of. Ark. Stat. Ann. §§ 43-2703, 2704 (Supp. 1973, Supp. 1975). Of course, this appellant did appeal, so the question of waiver, or right to waive appeal, is significant only to the extent that it has a bearing on the question of whether an appellate review is mandated by Eighth and Fourteenth Amendment requirements.

Appeals in criminal cases take precedence over all other cases on our docket. Ark. Stat. Ann. § 43-2701 (Repl. 1964). On appellate review, this court has the power to reduce the punishment, from that imposed by a circuit court for a higher degree of an offense than the evidence will support, to the punishment for that degree which the evidence will support. *Caton v. State*, 252 Ark. 420, 479 S.W. 2d 537. We have held that Ark. Stat. Ann. § 27-2144 (Repl. 1962) empowering this court to modify the judgment or order appealed from and enter such judgment as this court may, in its discretion deem just, is applicable to criminal cases. *Blake v. State*, 186 Ark. 77,

52 S.W. 2d 644; *Webb v. State*, 154 Ark. 67, 242 S.W. 380; *Smith v. State*, 205 Ark. 1075, 172 S.W. 2d 248. We have exercised this power in homicide cases, (see, e.g., *Blake v. State*, supra; *Webb v. State*, supra; *Brown v. State*, 34 Ark. 232) and in some instances in cases where the death penalty had been imposed. See, e.g., *Blake v. State*, supra; *Webb v. State*, supra. In *Blake*, we had this to say about our practice in the exercise of this power:

This power has frequently been exercised by this court in subsequent cases, and while the practice usually followed is to reverse the judgment on account of the excessive punishment, unless the Attorney General will consent that the trial court impose a lower sentence, that practice has not always been followed. The court, when it is thought proper to do so, has itself fixed the reduced punishment.

See also, *Smith v. State*, supra. We have also recently said that we might reduce the penalty unless the Attorney General elects to take a new trial. *Gaskin v. State*, 244 Ark. 541, 426 S.W. 2d 407. In *Hadley v. State*, 196 Ark. 307, 117 S.W. 2d 352, this court observed that there were numerous instances in which it had reduced the punishment of an appellant from death or life imprisonment. We lately recognized that we had the power to fix a reduced punishment where the death penalty had been imposed in *Bagley v. State*, 247 Ark. 113, 444 S.W. 2d 567.

The power of this court to reduce a sentence if it is deemed excessive was recognized in Ark. Stat. Ann. § 43-2725.2 (Supp. 1973, Supp. 1975). We have construed that act to preserve the distinction between executive clemency and appropriate judicial review of a sentence where there is error pertaining to the sentence. In *Abbott v. State*, 256 Ark. 558, 508 S.W. 2d 733, we said:

*** Although we have previously found it unnecessary to pass directly on the constitutionality of this provision insofar as it might be construed to empower this court to reduce a sentence otherwise proper and within statutory limits in cases arising after passage of the act, it should be clear that legislative action cannot override constitutional provisions. We strongly intimated that this

act was ineffective to overrule the holding in *Osborne v. State*, supra, in *Hurst v. State*, supra, and cited the case of *People v. Odle*, 37 Cal. 2d 52, 230 P. 2d 345 (1951). In that case a similar statute was construed by the California court to do no more than authorize it to reduce the punishment in lieu of granting a new trial, when the only error found on appellate review related to the punishment imposed and was prejudicial. It specifically held that the statute granted no power to modify a sentence where there was no error in the proceeding. To construe the statute otherwise, said the court, speaking through Justice Traynor, would give the reviewing court clemency powers similar to those vested in the Governor by the California Constitution. That court clearly recognized that any construction of the statute extending the power of the appellate court any further would raise serious constitutional questions relating to the separation of powers. We think the construction given to the California statute by that state's Supreme Court was correct and that the same construction should be given our statute. When given that construction, it is clearly constitutional. If construed to give this court the power to reduce a sentence in the absence of error pertaining to the sentence, the statute would be unconstitutional for violation of Art. 6, Sec. 18 and Art. 4, Sec. 2 of the Arkansas Constitution, and upon the authority of *Osborne v. State*, supra.

Such cases as *Osborne v. State*, 237 Ark. 5, 371 S.W. 2d 518; *Atwell v. State*, 244 Ark. 739, 427 S.W. 2d 1; and *Hooper v. State*, 257 Ark. 103, 514 S.W. 2d 394 do not limit our review in death penalty cases. There is a vast difference in reviewing a sentence for error (including error resulting from insufficient evidentiary support) in the sentencing procedure and reviewing a sentence resulting from a proper and legal sentencing procedure where sufficiency of evidence is not a basis for review. There is also a great difference in reducing a sentence when there is error in fixing the degree of the crime and reducing a sentence when there is not. The former has nothing to do with clemency. There is also a difference where nature of the punishment rather than the duration is at issue. See *Sneed v. State*, 159 Ark. 65, 255 S.W. 895. We long ago

recognized that the constitutional ban of cruel and unusual punishment is directed against the character of the punishment and not its duration. *Williams v. State*, 125 Ark. 287, 188 S.W. 826.

We have clearly made the distinction between those cases where reduction of the sentence is clemency and when it is a matter of proper judicial review. In *Rorie v. State*, 215 Ark. 282, 220 S.W. 2d 421, we said:

*** When this Court finds that the evidence is insufficient to support the punishment assessed, then we have the power to modify the punishment. Our cases clearly reflect, however, that this modification is done, not on a basis of judicial clemency, but only in a case in which the evidence would not sustain the higher punishment assessed. ***

In *Smith v. State*, 194 Ark. 1041, 110 S.W. 2d 24, we said:

*** It may be of a character so aggravated in its nature as to call for the severest possible penalty. If the jury thought so, then the trial court, wherein all the evidence was heard, must have determined that the verdict, severe as it was, was justified. We cannot presume otherwise. Besides, this court possesses no power inherent in the office of the chief executive, permitting us to pardon or remit penalties, although we may reduce extreme penalties when not supported by the evidence. ***

Allison v. State, 204 Ark. 609, 164 S.W. 2d 442, may be an aberration. It was decided when the death penalty was to be imposed for rape unless the jury, at its discretion, fixed the punishment at life imprisonment. We cannot now tell whether the court was saying, in *Allison*, that it had no power to reduce the sentence or that it declined to do so on the basis of the facts. If we were saying the former, the decision is not consistent with cases decided earlier. In any event, different degrees of the offense were not involved, as is the case here. *Allison* was cited in *Nail v. State*, 231 Ark. 70, 328 S.W. 2d 836, where this court had reviewed the evidence and found it sufficient to support the verdict of guilt of first degree murder.

But in *Nail*, we said that this court has no power to change the punishment fixed by the jury *unless the proof fails to sustain the charge for which the defendant is convicted*. This distinction is important when life felony murder is a lesser included offense on a charge of capital felony murder. It should also be noted that in *Nail*, *Rorie* is cited as authority. It is also worthy of note that *McCall v. State*, 230 Ark. 425, 323 S.W. 2d 421, is also cited as authority in *Nail*. In *McCall*, it was recognized that this court could reduce the punishment for the purpose of eliminating some error committed by the trial court. Somewhat later than *Allison*, we considered the matter in *Clark v. State*, 246 Ark. 876, 440 S.W. 2d 205, saying:

Thus the trial court's error had no bearing upon the jury's determination of guilt or innocence. It affected only the extent of the punishment to be imposed. In that situation we have a choice among several corrective measures. We may, depending upon the facts, reduce the punishment to the maximum for the lesser offense, reduce it to the minimum for the lesser offense, fix it ourselves at some intermediate point, remand the case to the trial court for the assessment of the penalty, or grant a new trial either absolutely or conditionally. Several of the cases were discussed in *Bailey v. State*, 206 Ark. 121, 173 S.W. 2d 1010 (1943).

Thus, neither *Allison* nor *Nail* would limit the power of this court to review a sentence of death imposed under the statutes governing the trial of Collins. We have in cases decided subsequently to *Allison* considered the circumstances revealed by the evidence to determine whether the death penalty was greater punishment than should have been imposed. See *Davis v. State*, 246 Ark. 838, 440 S.W. 2d 244, cert. den. 403 U.S. 954, 91 S. Ct. 2273, 29 L. Ed. 2d 865 [where we recognized the discretion of the trial court to reduce the punishment under Ark. Stat. Ann. § 43-2310 (Repl. 1964)]; *Young v. State*, 230 Ark. 737, 324 S.W. 2d 524. See also, *Walton v. State*, 232 Ark. 86, 334 S.W. 2d 657; *Hall v. State*, 209 Ark. 180, 189 S.W. 2d 917.

In capital offenses, for many years all errors of the lower court prejudicial to the rights of appellant have been required

to be heard and considered by this court and, if we found any prejudicial error by the trial court, this court was required to reverse and remand the cause for a new trial, or, in the discretion of this court, modify the judgment. Ark. Stat. Ann. § 43-2723 (Repl. 1964). In 1971, this particular statute was repealed but the scope of appellate review was not materially changed, except to extend this type of review to sentences for life imprisonment as well as death sentences. See Ark. Stat. Ann. § 43-2725 (Supp. 1973, Supp. 1975). The earlier statute was construed to mean that this mandated review required an examination of the trial record, even though the objectionable action which might be reversible error was not argued on appeal in any way. *Rorie v. State*, 215 Ark. 282, 220 S.W. 2d 421; *Hays v. State*, 230 Ark. 731, 324 S.W. 2d 520; *Young v. State*, 230 Ark. 737, 324 S.W. 2d 524. We have made the same application of the later one, citing *Rorie*. *Robertson v. State*, 256 Ark. 366, 507 S.W. 2d 513. We applied this type of review on the first appeal in this case.

Appellate review of cases in which the death penalty has been imposed has always been more comprehensive than in other cases. For, e.g., error in failure to properly instruct the jury with reference to punishments that it might impose has been held to be reversible, even though defendant did not request such an instruction. *Webb v. State*, 154 Ark. 67, 242 S.W. 380, 383 (opinion on rehearing); *Alford v. State*, 223 Ark. 330, 266 S.W. 2d 804.

We have recognized the power of this court under Ark. Stat. Ann. § 27-2144 (Repl. 1962) to reduce the punishment to that appropriate for the crime in cases in which we found error only in the sentencing procedure. *Wilburn v. State*, 253 Ark. 608, 487 S.W. 2d 600; *Walker v. State*, 91 Ark. 497, 121 S.W. 925; *Williams v. State*, 66 Ark. 264, 50 S.W. 517. We have exercised this power in capital cases, by reducing the punishment to life imprisonment, when error by the trial court could have affected the sentence only, holding that a new trial would not be required in such cases. *Crowe v. State*, 178 Ark. 1121, 13 S.W. 2d 606. In some of these cases we have reduced the penalty to life imprisonment subject to the election of the Attorney General to request a new trial. See *Williams v. State*, 183 Ark. 870, 39 S.W. 2d 295. We have recognized the existence of this power as recently as *Bagley v.*

State, 247 Ark. 113, 444 S.W. 2d 567.

Unquestionably this court has the right, power and duty to reduce the punishment in any case where there is any indication that it resulted from passion and prejudice. *Hadley v. State*, 196 Ark. 307, 117 S.W. 2d 352; *Wilkerson v. State*, 209 Ark. 138, 189 S.W. 2d 800. We have done so by reducing a sentence of death on a rape charge to life imprisonment. *Hogan v. State*, 191 Ark. 437, 86 S.W. 2d 931. We have also carefully reviewed evidence to determine whether there was an abuse of discretion by the trial court or jury in fixing a punishment within statutory limits. *Wilkerson v. State*, supra; *Rutledge v. State*, 222 Ark. 504, 262 S.W. 2d 650.

The powers of this court to order a new trial are somewhat limited, but in cases such as the one before us, the court is not impotent. In *Oliver v. State*, 34 Ark. 632, where the charge was murder and the verdict manslaughter, this court ordered a new trial. The scope of review in such cases was thoroughly analyzed and articulately stated in the opinion by Justice Eakin, viz:

There is another class of cases, in which there has been evidence of some facts, from which the jury has inferred other facts necessary to sustain the verdict, in which this court has granted a new trial on the grounds that the facts shown did not warrant the inference, and that therefore the evidence was insufficient. *** These are not cases of *conflict*, but want of evidence. *** Of course, no positive rules can be announced of strict and unvarying application, but the general policy of the court may be fairly understood from what has been said.

It will be seen, and in view of a very common misapprehension it is worth noting, that this court has never adopted the rule of refusing a new trial in all or any cases, where there has been *any evidence whatever*, however weak, to support the verdict — what is called a *scintilla* of evidence. The following more rational rules seem to result from all the decisions:

1. Where there has been a *conflict* of evidence a new trial will not be granted here, merely because the

preponderance of evidence, in the mind of the court, may seem to be against the verdict. That deference will be accorded to the jury whose peculiar province it is to compare, sift, and weigh the evidence; and to the circuit judge, whose duty it is to supervise the trial, and grant a new one, if, in his opinion, the verdict has resulted from improper influence, misconduct of jurors, excitement, prejudice, hasty judgment, misapprehension of the law, or any other of the recognized causes for a new trial.

2. But in all cases, even those of conflict, this court will direct a new trial, when, upon inspection of the evidence, the verdict is so clearly and palpably against the weight of it as to shock a sense of justice. The line lies between a mere preponderance within the bounds of a fair difference of opinion, and that gross preponderance which indicates an unreasoning passion or prejudice on the part of the jury, or misapprehension of the law, or disregard of the legitimate sphere of their action.

3. A new trial will be granted when there is no evidence at all to support the verdict, or where it fails in some material link. The jury will not be allowed to supply the missing link by inferences and presumptions from other facts unless they be legitimate and fair presumptions, such as naturally follow.

We come now to the delicate and responsible duty of applying these rules to the case before us. There is little conflict of evidence concerning the occurrences at the time of the killing, and nothing to affect materially the credit of any witness. Indeed they agree in an exceptional manner.

***Considering the character and motives of Yerby, it is so plain to us that the Olivers were in danger, and so probable that death would have resulted to one of them had Yerby not been killed, that it shocks our sense of

justice, under the evidence presented, to deny him the benefit of self-defense. We think the verdict plainly and palpably contrary to the weight of evidence, and that this case falls legitimately within the exception to the rule against disturbing verdicts.

In addition, if the Attorney General feels that the evidence is insufficient to support a verdict, and this court has doubts about it, a new trial will be granted in the interest of justice. *Thomas v. State*, 72 Ark. 582, 82 S.W. 202; *Blaylock v. State*, 187 Ark. 606, 61 S.W. 2d 72. We have also reduced the punishment, even when the evidence was sufficient to support the verdict of guilt of the proper crime or degree of crime but the jury obviously failed to consider mitigating circumstances. See *Traylor v. State*, 80 Ark. 617, 96 S.W. 505; *Petty v. State*, 76 Ark. 515, 89 S.W. 465, even where the appellant had been sentenced to death. *Davis v. State*, 155 Ark. 245, 244 S.W. 750. We recognize that punishment is cruel and unusual when it is so wholly disproportionate to the nature of the offense as to shock the moral sense of the community. *Carter v. State*, 255 Ark. 225, 500 S.W. 2d 368; *Geurin v. City of Little Rock*, 203 Ark. 103, 155 S.W. 2d 719.

We find that the Arkansas system of prosecuting and sentencing those found guilty of a charge of capital felony murder provides adequate safeguards against arbitrary, capricious or freakish imposition of the death penalty to successfully pass constitutional examination in the light of the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendment standards ascertainable from the *Woodson-Roberts-Gregg-Proffitt-Jurek* quintuplet offspring of *Furman*.

The offense of capital felony murder is carefully defined and narrowly restricted, and the focus of the trial is on a particularized crime. The jury making the determination must first find unanimously that the accused is guilty of one of the narrowly defined categories of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt. If a guilty verdict is returned, the same jury, in the sentencing phase of a bifurcated trial may then hear testimony tending to show one or more specifically enumerated groups of aggravating circumstances plus evidence relevant to mitigating circumstances; but the death

penalty cannot be imposed unless the jury unanimously finds, beyond a reasonable doubt, that one or more aggravating circumstance exist (specifying in writing which of them does) and finds that aggravating circumstances outweigh any mitigating circumstances found to exist. This procedure permits the jury in either the first or second phase of the trial to consider the nature and circumstances of the crime and to give regard to the past life and habits of the particular offender. The view taken by the Arkansas lawmakers was that all serious felonies, such as murder, are not identical, either as to the gravity of the offense or the moral culpability of the offender. *Collins v. State*, 259 Ark. 8, 531 S.W. 2d 13. The jury will be given adequate information relevant to imposition of sentence. It is provided with standards to guide its use of that information. Thus, the possibility that the death sentence will be imposed arbitrarily or capriciously is substantially reduced.

There is ample means for the judiciary to check the wanton, arbitrary or capricious exercise of the power and discretion of the jury to determine who shall die for the crime of murder.

In the first place there is a meaningful check at the trial court level. The trial judge, before pronouncement of the death sentence and entry of judgment, may consider appropriate matters of mitigation, and any other matters appropriate, both favorable and adverse, to the defendant. The defendant must be given the opportunity to show legal cause why sentence should not be pronounced or any of the recognized grounds for a new trial, among which are: (1) the verdict is contrary to the law or the evidence; (2) misconduct of the jury; and (3) the defendant has not, in the opinion of the judge, received a fair and impartial trial. The latitude of the trial judge's discretion is broad. He may set aside a verdict when he is satisfied the ends of justice would be thereby served and should do so where he has reason to believe it is the result of passion, prejudice or any factor other than a calm consideration of the facts in evidence. This discretion is applicable when the jury verdict would result in the imposition of the death penalty, if the judge finds, for any reason, that the circumstances of the case do not warrant the imposition of the death penalty.

The discretion of the jury and that of the trial judge are sufficiently directed and limited to minimize the risk of wholly arbitrary and capricious action in imposing the death penalty. The trial judge must advise the defendant, at the time of sentencing, of his right to appeal, and defense counsel has obligations to see that the right is preserved.

There is a meaningful appellate review by this court of the appropriateness of the death penalty in a particular case, considering both the punishment and any errors on points raised in the trial court, including the sufficiency of the evidence to support any part of the jury verdict. This appellate review includes: (1) a determination whether the sentence was the result of passion, prejudice or any arbitrary factor; (2) whether the evidence supports the jury's finding of any statutory aggravating circumstances; (3) whether the evidence supports the jury's findings on the question whether mitigating circumstances outweigh aggravating ones; (4) whether the sentence is excessive. On appellate review, this court can reduce the sentence, or grant a new trial, in its discretion, if the sentence is excessive or there is error affecting the sentence only, or where there is insufficient evidentiary support for the sentence. Of course, the exercise of discretion by the trial judge is always subject to review for abuse. The "freak" or disparate death sentence would certainly warrant reversal or reduction as shocking to our sense of justice.

There is no specific requirement that this court compare sentences in other cases; however, the scope of permissible review of the sentence on appeal would necessarily require that we consult prior cases as precedent for our determining whether there was error in the sentencing procedure, whether the evidence was sufficient to support any finding made by the jury, whether any of the findings was the result of passion or prejudice or any other arbitrary factor and whether there had been an abuse of the discretion of either the jury or the trial judge in imposing the sentence. We recognized in our first consideration of this case that, since the jury's findings with respect to the various aggravating or mitigating circumstances must be in writing, the basis for its verdict will be known and can be compared with the punishment in other cases, noting that this general approach to the problem had been upheld in *State v. Dixon*, 283 S. 2d 1 (Fla., 1973); *Coley v.*

State, 231 Ga. 829, 204 S.E. 2d 612 (1974); *Jurek v. State*, *supra*.

These sentencing and review procedures certainly leave no substantial risk that the death sentence will be imposed randomly, arbitrarily, capriciously, wantonly or freakishly, and tend to promote evenhanded, rational and consistent imposition of the death penalty. In addition to the powers and responsibilities of the judicial system, the Arkansas system of checks and balances provides for an additional safeguard as a check against the arbitrary, capricious, freakish or wanton imposition of the death penalty in the executive branch, i.e., the power of the Governor of Arkansas to commute a sentence. Art. 6, § 18, Constitution of Arkansas. This power should not be totally ignored in reviewing a state's system to determine whether it provides adequate safeguards against the death penalty as cruel and unusual punishment prohibited by the Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution. Recognition was given to the significance of this power in the statute under which Collins was tried. Ark. Stat. Ann. § 41-4714 (Supp. 1973).

A commutation is a modification of sentence or mitigation of the punishment to be given. *Whan v. State*, 485 S.W. 2d 275 (Tex. Cr. App., 1972), cert. den. 411 U.S. 934, 93 S. Ct. 1906, 36 L. Ed. 2d 394; *Ex parte Collins*, 94 Mo. 22, 6 S.W. 345 (1887); *Application of White*, 166 Misc. 481, 2 N.Y.S. 2d 582 (1938). It changes the punishment imposed to a less severe one and leaves the sentence in a modified form. *Williams v. Brents*, 171 Ark. 367, 284 S.W. 56; *Duchay v. Thompson*, 223 F. 305 (9 Cir., 1915), affd. 217 F. 484; *Ex parte Collins*, *supra*; *Ex parte Denton*, 69 Okla. Cr. 204, 101 P. 2d 276 (1940); *People v. Frost*, 133 App. Div. 179, 117 N.Y.S. 524, 23 N. Y. Cr. 544 (1909); *People v. Larkman*, 137 Misc. 466, 244 N.Y.S. 431 (1930). A death sentence may be modified to one of life imprisonment by commutation. *Biddle v. Perovich*, 274 U.S. 480, 47 S. Ct. 664, 71 L. Ed. 1161, 52 ALR 832 (1927); *Ex parte Denton*, *supra*; *Duchay v. Thompson*, *supra*; *People v. Frost*, *supra*. See also, *Ex parte Wells*, 59 U.S. 307, 15 L. Ed. 421 (1855); *Schick v. Reed*, 419 U.S. 256, 95 S. Ct. 379, 42 L. Ed. 2d 430 (1974). We take judicial notice that this power has been exercised by Arkansas governors. See, e.g., Governor's Clemency Proclamations, March 29, 1967 to _____

Nos. 2395-2409, Office of the Secretary of State. The act applicable here provided procedures which would tend to prevent the arbitrary exercise of this power. It should be presumed that in the exercise of the power, the Governor would necessarily compare a sentence with other sentences which had been commuted as well as with sentences on which commutation had not been granted. He might well make comparisons with cases where this court had either affirmed death sentences or reduced them.

Comparative review of the sentence in this case is difficult because this is the first case to reach us for review since the repeal of the statute giving juries virtually unlimited discretion in deciding which of those found guilty of murder in the first degree should live or die. The affirmance of cases when that discretion was considered to be so broad furnishes no basis for comparison. This was a vicious murder of an elderly employer for pecuniary gain, which followed a brutal assault upon the employer's elderly wife (who miraculously survived), apparently for the purpose of obtaining the weapon with which the mortal wound was inflicted. An inference that, after the vicious robbery-murder was committed, this once-convicted robber was bent upon the pursuit of other such crimes is justifiable from evidence of his theft of an automobile in Madison County and his alteration of the death weapon stolen from Welch to convert it into a sawed-off, double-barrelled shotgun, which he immediately took to the most populous area of the state. There was certainly sufficient evidence to support the jury's finding of aggravating circumstances outweighing the mitigating circumstances of appellant's youth. There was no substantial evidence which would support a finding of any other mitigating circumstance, and appellant's youth in this case deserves little weight, in the circumstances. To say the least, we are unable to find any case in which this court has reduced a death penalty where there was such a dearth of mitigating circumstance and such seriously aggravating circumstances.

We adhere to the views we expressed on the former appeal and since we find that the imposition of the death penalty was not in violation of the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, we reinstate

the judgment and it is accordingly

Affirmed.

GEORGE ROSE SMITH, HOLT and HICKMAN, JJ., dissent.

APPENDIX

Ark. Stat. Ann. § 41-1501 (Criminal Code 1976) changed the felony murder rule [formerly Ark. Stat. Ann. § 41-4702 (Supp. 1973)] by eliminating mass transit piracy and treason and adding escape in the first degree to the list of felonies to which the rule is applicable; and by including provisions creating accomplice liability (and affirmative defenses for an accomplice); by extending the rule to include a killing committed in immediate flight from an included felony; and by providing that the death be caused "under circumstances manifesting extreme indifference to the value of human life."

It also changed the focus of an unlawful killing involving a public official from (E) the unlawful killing of a public official resulting from a premeditated design to kill anyone, to (d) the unlawful killing of anyone resulting from a premeditated design to kill a public official. It added murder pursuant to agreement as a capital murder.

Ark. Stat. Ann. § 41-1304 (Criminal Code 1976) is different from § 41-4712 (Supp. 1973) in that it states that mitigating circumstances are not limited to those provided in the statute and by adding as mitigation the fact that the defendant has no significant history of prior criminal activity.

Mitigating circumstances are no longer limited to those provided in the statute and now include the circumstance that the defendant has no significant history of prior criminal activity. Ark. Stat. Ann. § 41-1304 (Criminal Code, 1976) § 41-4712 (Supp. 1973).

Aggravating circumstances were changed somewhat as they relate to a person who has a prior record of commission of a felony. Ark. Stat. Ann. § 41-1303 (Criminal Code, 1976), § 41-4711 (Supp. 1973).

Substantive changes in trial procedure, § 41-1301 (Criminal Code, 1976), formerly § 41-4710 (Supp. 1973), include a provision that evidence of mitigating circumstances may be presented regardless of whether the evidence is admissible under the rules of evidence; and for waiver of the death penalty by the prosecutor, expressly or by stipulation as to the facts of mitigating and aggravating circumstances, after trial. § 41-1302 (Criminal Code, 1976) allocates the burden of proof during the sentencing phase of a capital trial.

GEORGE ROSE SMITH, Justice, dissenting. On July 2, 1976, the Supreme Court of the United States sustained newly enacted death-penalty statutes in Georgia, Florida and Texas. In all three cases Justice Stewart's opinion stressed a provision for mandatory appellate review as a safeguard against arbitrary action in the trial court. In the Georgia case, for example, he pointed out that "[i]n addition to the conventional appellate process available in all criminal cases, provision is made for special expedited direct review by the Supreme Court of Georgia of the appropriateness of imposing the sentence of death in the particular case."

In the present case the majority states: "Concededly, there is no mandatory appellate review in Arkansas." An effort is then made to show that our present laws in fact assure an appellate review in every case. As the majority observe, however, the review depends upon the trial judge and defense counsel's performance of duties imposed upon them by law or by professional obligation. In view of all the delays, oversights, and errors that can occur in any voluntary system of appellate review, I cannot agree that our procedure is fully as expeditious and effective as those which were sustained in the Georgia, Florida, and Texas cases.

As to the *Gilmore* opinions, I cannot read into them such a sweeping statement of law as the majority are able to find there. Any constitutional right can be waived. For instance, a jury trial is mandatory in criminal cases, but that right may be waived. Similarly, a person condemned to death could waive the benefit of a mandatory appellate review, but, as I

understand the Supreme Court's position in the three cases upholding the death-penalty statutes, the mandatory review ought to be provided in the first place, leaving the accused the option of affirmatively declining it if he so desired.

Of course I concede the substantial possibility that in this case the majority will prove to be right and I to be wrong. Yet the opposite possibility also exists. In the circumstances an immediate revision of our statutes, to conform to those upheld in Georgia, Florida, or Texas, might in the long run prove to have been a wise precautionary measure.

HOLT, J., joins in this dissent.

DARRELL HICKMAN, Justice, dissenting. A majority of the justices of the United States Supreme Court, while disagreeing on the legal and moral questions of the death penalty, have agreed it is the arbitrary or freakish use of the penalty rather than the punishment itself which violates the United States Constitution. See *Furman v. Georgia*, 408 U.S. 238 (1972). In this context the Supreme Court finally approved the law and procedure in Georgia, *Gregg v. Georgia*, 428 U.S. 153, 96 S. Ct. 2909 (1976). The two opinions approving the Georgia law and procedure commented especially on two areas of responsibility — sentencing at the trial level and review of the sentence by the state appellate court. In Georgia, the trial judge must review the sentence and file a special written report justifying the death penalty. Appeal to the Georgia Supreme Court is prompt and automatic. The Georgia court determines if the death sentence was imposed under the influence of passion, prejudice or any other arbitrary factor. A special assistant to the court accumulates records of all capital cases for use in comparison. The sentence is then compared with sentences in similar cases to determine if it is excessive or disproportionate. The Georgia court has found that the law imposes on it a duty to set aside a death sentence that is out-of-line with the penalty in similar cases.

In the two opinions approving the Georgia law, special comment was made regarding the Georgia appellate review as a check against the random or arbitrary use of the death

penalty. In the opinion written by Justice Stewart, the court said:

It is apparent that the Supreme Court of Georgia has taken its review responsibilities seriously. *Gregg*, 428 U.S. 153, 96 S. Ct. 2909, 2940 (1976).

The opinion written by Justice White, after commenting on prompt and automatic review, report of the trial judge, comparison of similar cases and a history of setting aside excessive penalties, stated:

Indeed, if the Georgia Supreme Court properly performs the task assigned to it under the Georgia statutes, death sentences imposed for discriminatory reasons or wantonly or freakishly for any given category of crime will be set aside. *Gregg*, 428 U.S. 153, 96 S. Ct. 2909, 2949 (1976).

In comparison, Arkansas has no provision for a special report by the trial judge; there is no mandatory appeal law; there is no special assistant collecting records of capital cases; there is no provision for comparing sentences; there is no recent history of reducing cases simply because they are excessive. To the contrary, this court reversed itself and found there was no legal authority to reduce a sentence simply because it was excessive. *Osborne v. State*, 237 Ark. 5, 371 S.W. 518 (1963). The Arkansas Legislature, after the *Osborne* case, gave this court the express authority to reduce sentences simply because they were excessive. Ark. State. Ann. § 43-2725.2 (Supp. 1975). This court even rejected that law, stating that such a power was unconstitutional because it amounted to the use of clemency power. *Hooper v. State*, 257 Ark. 103, 514 S.W. 2d 394 (1974).

The majority opinion quotes some cases in the early history of this court as evidence that this court has reduced sentences as excessive. See *Hadley v. State*, 196 Ark. 307, 117 S.W. 2d 352 (1938). However the *Hadley* case and other similar cases were specifically overruled by the *Osborne* case. The language of the *Osborne* case could not be more specific, and I quote it for emphasis.

Counsel vigorously maintains that the punishment is so severe that it should be reduced by this court. It is true that in a number of the older cases, including one as recent as *Carson v. State*, 206 Ark. 80, 173 S.W. 2d 122, we have assumed the power to mitigate the punishment imposed by the trial courts. The right to exercise clemency is, however, vested not in the courts but in the chief executive. Ark. Const., Art. 6, § 18. Our latest cases have uniformly followed the rule, which we think to be sound, that the sentence is to be fixed by the jury rather than by this court. If the testimony supports the conviction for the offense in question and if the sentence is within the limits set by the legislature, we are not at liberty to reduce it even though we may think it to be unduly harsh.

If this language were not enough, it was made perfectly clear in the *Hooper* case that this court would not reduce a sentence because it was excessive, or was based on passion and prejudice. For emphasis, I will quote the language from the *Hooper* case.

Finally, it is asserted that the verdict of the Jury is excessive and indicates passion and prejudice on the part of the jury. We have held that we have no authority to reduce a sentence that is not in excess of statutory limits, and we have consistently, in recent years, followed that rule.

The majority opinion, although implying otherwise, makes it clear the *Osborne* and *Hooper* cases will continue to be the law followed by a majority of the court. This means a sentence to death will not be reduced because it is excessive, out-of-line with punishment in similar cases, or the result of passion or prejudice.

I believe the decisions of this court in the *Osborne* and *Hooper* cases were wrong and should be overruled. It is not a matter of clemency to correct an injustice; it is simply the law at work.

The same date the *Gregg* case was published, the U.S. Supreme Court also approved the capital punishment laws in

Florida and Texas. In approving the capital punishment laws in these states, the court used the principles of the *Gregg* case as an example; although the opinions were brief, the message was the same — the responsible use of capital punishment. Commenting on the Florida law, the court stated:

In fact, it is apparent that the Florida Court has undertaken responsibly to perform its function of death sentence review with a maximum of rationality and consistency. For example, it has several times compared the circumstances of a case under review with those of previous cases in which it has assessed the imposition of death sentences. *Proffitt v. Florida*, 428 U.S. 242, 96 S. Ct. 2960, 2969 (1976).

Reviewing the Texas law, the court stated:

By providing prompt judicial review of the jury's decision in a court with statewide jurisdiction, Texas has provided a means to promote the even-handed, rational and consistent imposition of death sentences under law. Because this system serves to assure that sentences of death will not be "wantonly" or "freakishly" imposed, it does not violate the Constitution. *Jurek v. Texas*, 428 U.S. 262, 96 S. Ct. 2950, 2958 (1976).

Comparing the procedures approved in these three cases with those in Arkansas, there is little doubt that a great deal remains to be done before the Arkansas law and procedure will be approved by the Supreme Court. First, there must be a law that the appeal of capital cases is prompt and automatic. Second, a majority of this court must accept the responsibility and see as its duty the obligation to compare sentences and to reduce any disproportionate sentence. Third, a majority of this court must recognize the authority and accept the duty to reduce any sentence found to be arbitrary, excessive or the result of passion or prejudice. In other words, this court cannot place the entire responsibility of the death penalty on the jury and the trial court, but must assume responsibility for insuring that the death penalty is rationally and fairly imposed.

It is clear to me that the Supreme Court of the United

States would like nothing better than to put this matter at rest. However, approval is predicated on a procedure for a fair and impartial sentence at the trial level, and a procedure for prompt and meaningful review by the appellate court.

The majority of this court cannot yet see all the deficiencies in the Arkansas law, but to me they are quite clear. Therefore, I will dissent.

Kathryn L. ALLEN v. FIRST
NATIONAL BANK of Fort Smith,
Executor of the Estate of
George W. ALLEN, Deceased

76-216—217

547 S.W. 2d 118

Opinion delivered March 7, 1977
(In Banc)

1. INSURANCE — NAMED BENEFICIARY, RIGHT OF TO COLLECT — DIVORCE DECREE & PROPERTY SETTLEMENT, EFFECT OF. — Where a property settlement incorporated into a decree of divorce does not specifically mention certain life insurance policies on one of the spouses, the rights of the designated beneficiaries in such contracts of insurance are determined according to contractual law, without regard to the effect of a divorce between the insured and the beneficiary.
2. INSURANCE — CHANGE OF BENEFICIARY — CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS, SUBSTANTIAL COMPLIANCE WITH NECESSARY. — A written statement executed by the insured, designating a change in the beneficiary of his life insurance policies, but not delivered to the insurance companies or their designated agents prior to the death of the insured, is not a substantial compliance with contractual requirements and does not amount to a change of a beneficiary.
3. INSURANCE — CHANGE OF BENEFICIARY — DILIGENCE TO EFFECTUATE CHANGE REQUIRED. — Where the insured left his change of beneficiaries statement or request in his attorney's office for three years, while, at the same time, he made annual premium payments, surrendered and cashed policies, and took out an additional policy in favor of his new wife, it cannot be said that he